INTER-
NATIONAL
LIBRARY

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE

George P. Adams.

June 1920.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/cathsocialism00nittiala

CATHOLIC SOCIALISM

CATHOLIC SOCIALISM

BY

FRANCESCO S. NITTI

PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL ECONOMY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NAPLES, AUTHOR OF "POPULATION AND THE SOCIAL SYSTEM," ETC., ETC.

TRANSLATED FROM THE SECOND ITALIAN EDITION BY

MARY MACKINTOSH

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY

DAVID G. RITCHIE, M.A.

PROFESSOR OF LOGIC AND METAPHYSICS IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS

Les murmures des pauvres sont justes.
Pourquoi, Seigneur, cette inégalité des conditions?

(The murmurs of the poor are just.
Wherefore, O Lord, this inequality of conditions?)

BOSSUET

LONDON
SWAN SONNENSCHEIN & CO.
NEW YORK: MACMILLAN & CO.
1908

HX54
N57M33
1908

Printed by Cowan & Co., Limited, Perth.

[*Author's Dedication.*]

TO THE BELOVED MEMORY OF

MY SISTER LUIGIA

INSPIRER OF MY STUDIES,

ADORED COMPANION OF MY YOUTH,

WHO DIED, AGED 20, 2ND JUNE, 1890.

INTRODUCTION.

THE author of this book, who is Professor of Political Economy in the University of Naples, hardly needs to be introduced to English readers. He has contributed articles to the *Economic Review*, the organ of the Oxford branch of the Christian Social Union, and his work on *Population* has already been translated into English. The present volume, as he tells us in the Preface, is intended to form part of a critical study of all the important types of modern Socialism. It may be well to repeat the warning, which the author has emphasised in the "advertisement" to the Second Edition, that his method is "positive" and that his aim has been to make his treatment of the subject "strictly objective". In other words, this book is not, in intention, either Socialistic or Anti-Socialistic, either Catholic or Anti-Catholic, but an attempt to give an impartial statement of facts. The author has already shared the usual fortune of impartiality and has been attacked from both sides, being called an "ardent Socialist" by some and accused by others of "anti-clerical and bourgeois scepticism". The First Edition, published in 1890, attracted much attention in Europe, and several Catholic newspapers even recognised that it did something to hasten the publication of the Pope's Encyclical of May, 1891.

A primary reason for translating the book into

English is that it contains a mass of important materials, not otherwise accessible in our language, nor, so far as I know, collected together in any French or German work. Much that is interesting and excellent has recently been written on Socialism in English. The economic theories of Marx have been expounded, refuted and defended, almost *ad nauseam.* The "tragi-comedy" of Lassalle's life and death, the story of his agitation and its consequences have been made familiar beyond the circle of special students. We have amongst ourselves professed Socialists, of different degrees of heat and light; and we have long left behind that stage at which a criticism of the schemes of Owen, Saint-Simon, Fourier, and other devisers of private associations for social reform, was considered a sufficient method of dealing with Socialism. But on the "Christian Socialism" of continental countries our authorities have been content to write briefly and without giving us any detailed account of the men concerned in the various movements covered by that name, or of the vast amount of published writings in which their views are expounded. Professor Nitti supplies this deficiency in a work which is full, learned, sympathetic, and yet impartial. Its subject, moreover, has a very special interest at this time. To no student of society, to no practical politician or social reformer can it be a matter of indifference what attitude towards the most pressing of modern problems is taken by the largest section of Christendom. While the relation between Socialism and Christianity in general is a matter of the highest interest, but on which there may be much dispute,

the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church to Socialism admits of more exact study and of more precise statement. In Protestantism the diversity of sects and the fact that the individual preacher everywhere counts for more and "the Church" for less, render any general statement more difficult, whereas, in spite of great local differences, the Roman discipline and organisation make of wider significance any principles adopted and proclaimed by conspicuous members of the clerical order without reprimand from the Vatican; and, it hardly needs to be added, a Papal Encyclical has an official authority to which no utterance of any Protestant ecclesiastic can openly lay claim.

It is perhaps necessary to explain to some English readers that in continental use the word "Evangelical" simply means "Protestant," and that by "Liberalism" is always meant the principle of *laissez-faire* in regard to economic matters, and often also "free-thinking" or "secularism" in regard to religion. "Catholic," of course, means "Roman Catholic". Anglicans are included by the writer under the general head of "Evangelical". The peculiar claims of Anglicanism naturally find a difficulty in obtaining appreciation from outside. A due understanding of the difference between the Anglican and the other Churches of the Reformation might, however, suggest an explanation of what otherwise seems a puzzling problem, *viz.*, that Socialism and the "Labour movement" generally have me, with more sympathy among a certain number of vigorous High Churchmen in the Established Church of England, than amongst Low Churchmen or Protestant Nonconformists. The explanation is simply

part of the reason why Christian Socialism generally is more Catholic than Protestant. Protestantism is individualistic, in a sense in which Catholicism is not. Although to some English readers the author's brief references to our ecclesiastical, political and social questions may seem to alter the usual perspective in which they are accustomed to see things, this is not altogether a disadvantage: it is often a good thing "to see ourselves as others see us".

This translation was made by a Roman Catholic lady living in Rome, who was deeply interested in the attitude of her Church to the social question. She died before completing the revision of the proofs. The work, I understand, was done amid the weakness and suffering of long illness. The translator although perfectly familiar with Italian had apparently lost to some extent a close familiarity with her own tongue. It has only been possible in a rapid revision of the final proofs to remedy to some extent the consequent defects, and to alter a word or phrase here and there for the sake of clearness. Here and there, it will be observed, the translator has felt bound, as a devout Catholic, to dissent from statements of the author.[1] This has been done with his knowledge and authorisation. Professor Nitti has himself read through the proofs of the English translation.

DAVID G. RITCHIE.

ST. ANDREWS,
9th May, 1895.

[1] See, *e.g.*, notes on pp. 72, 114, 120, 137. On p. 58, note 4, the translator, in criticising the author, seems to have forgotten the parallel passage in Luke, vi., 20.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

On the morrow of the Revolution of 1848, which drenched France in blood, and was re-echoed throughout the rest of Europe, Socialism seemed crushed for ever; and the historians and economists of the day hastened to pronounce its funeral oration, or rather, sentence of condemnation.

Yet, at this present moment, Socialism is more alive, more feared, more powerful than it has ever been. In vain have political economy and anthropology condemned its various systems as contrary to modern science and the results of positive research; in vain have many Utopias faded before the vivid light of reality. Even while we condemn Socialism, considering as mere dreams of morbid imaginations, or of idealists wanting in all sense of the reality of things, those schemes for the reconstruction of the social fabric that inflame the popular mind and threaten to submerge modern society; even while we censure the brutal conception of life and its aims which forms the ideal of social democracy, we feel that in this Niagara of contradictions, errors and uncertainties, which are the basis of Socialism, there is nevertheless a something that defies our criticism. Though the systems of Socialism may be false, or contradictory, or Utopian, the morality it teaches is by far superior to that of its adversaries.

Thus it is that in spite of all our efforts, the popular classes, deluded by a few specious formulas, the hollowness of which they are unable to discern, gradually become more and more estranged from us, and that Socialism, like some new Antæus, gathering life and strength from the earth that gave it birth, daily assumes a more hostile attitude towards civilisation and the future of society. The demi-god destined to smother Socialism in his mighty and fatal embrace is not yet born, or is too far off, whereas, unlike Antæus in this respect, the new-born son of the earth clings tenaciously to its mother, nor has ever quitted her for an instant.

The Paris Congress, the German elections in 1890, the monster demonstrations of the 1st May, 1891, 1892, are all recent events that clearly prove how profoundly the sub-soil of modern society, that fruit of the slow, upward labour of ages, is undermined by popular discontent.

The thoughtless manner in which we have hitherto discussed these weighty problems, on which existing society depends, is truly deplorable. We have proclaimed that the will of the people is superior to every other power, and yet we bow resignedly under the most frightful of all tyrannies, that of parliamentary majorities. But now that the masses have acquired political power, they feel all the more heavily the crushing weight of their own misery. And partly through ambition, partly through vanity, partly through ignorance the demagogues speculate upon this feeling, promising things that are utterly unattainable, as if social relations could be durably modified by ministerial decrees, or by any law of mere parliamentary initiative. Our writers, philosophers and politicians, never weary

of inculcating to the people the doctrines of Materialism, and of striving to destroy that religious faith which long ages of inheritance had so firmly implanted in their souls. Hence comes it that day by day the very foundations of society become more insecure; and it is precisely the men who diffuse these principles who are most obstinate in ignoring the consequences to which they must lead.

The Liberal school has urged the masses onward in the path of Socialism, granting them political power, accustoming them to large promises, despoiling them of all religious belief, yet offering them no better compensation than vain and empty phrases.

What wonder then if the people draw the logical consequences of the principles thus diffused among them? What wonder if, robbed of the Gospel of Christ, they embrace that of Bakunin? if seeing themselves deluded in all their hopes, and derided by the very men who had promised them so much, what wonder if they turn their anxious eyes to Socialism, and from it expect redemption and prosperity? And finally, if having been taught to believe that civil and political equality would cancel all social injustices, and discovering that, on the contrary, the very liberty thus given them but tends to increase their ills, what wonder if, no longer willing to content themselves with the empty formulas of politicians, they now aspire to economic liberty?

The principles of the French Revolution are daily losing ground. How can a code that interdicts all collective and lasting enterprise beget anything but sordid weakness? Renan was, therefore, perfectly right in saying that the new men who, during the last

years of the eighteenth century, liquidated in so miserable a fashion the bankruptcy of the Revolution, did but prepare a generation of rebellious pigmies.

The social question—for, in the clear light of facts, who can deny that it exists?—is not only based on an economic problem, but constitutes of itself a vast moral problem, the resolution of which modern society may try to delay, but which sooner or later must be faced.

It is the Sphinx of modern times, and we stand in the presence of the same cruel dilemma which in bygone days tortured other societies no less flourishing, no less endowed with intellectual light than is our modern society: cruel dilemma which, if we would not perish, must be solved.

If in spite of our criticisms and its own errors and uncertainties, Socialism has spread so rapidly, it means that within its very nature lies a great moral force, which we may indeed refuse to acknowledge but cannot suppress.

All those who have written on the subject of Socialism show how difficult they find it to completely divest their minds of prejudice.

My intention is to study throughout a series of volumes, and with the utmost calm and impartiality, the principal forms of modern Socialism: Religious Socialism, Anarchical Socialism, Collectivism, State Socialism, etc. In setting myself this task I fully appreciate the difficulties that beset the undertaking before me, in which my strength indeed may fail me, my courage never!

Even those who dedicate themselves to the special study of Socialism very frequently show that they are unacquainted with the real tendencies of the numerous

social schools. Now, to remedy an evil it is necessary to study it and know it in all its different phases.

I have confined my first volume to Catholic Socialism, as being, perhaps, that form least generally known, and also because, since the last Catholic Socialist Congresses that have been held, I consider that all are bound to know what are the tendencies of this new school, which, while unlike the other systems of Socialism it seeks to reform society in the name of God, does not on that account seek to modify it any the less profoundly.

I may probably appear to be too minute in my statement of the theories of Catholic Socialists; the fact is, I wish to be exact at whatever cost. Up to the present day no complete study on this subject has as yet been written in Italy, and the very few that have appeared in other countries are either too incomplete or too one-sided. Consequently, the difficulties I have encountered in the sifting of a new argument with new materials have been neither slight nor few.

Though new systems are daily springing into life, Socialism remains as yet more an aspiration than a doctrine, and whoever desires to study the phenomenon thoroughly and conscientiously must consider it in all its parts and under all its aspects. I can only hope that my task, which has cost me no small labour, but has been a labour of love, may prove neither useless nor superfluous.

FRANCESCO S. NITTI.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER PAGE

INTRODUCTION BY PROFESSOR RITCHIE, - - - - - v

AUTHOR'S PREFACE, - - - - - - - - - ix

I. SOCIALISM AND CHRISTIANITY, - - - - - -

Ancient Socialism and Modern Writers—Social Conflicts of Antiquity and Socialism—Socialism and Democracy are Modern Phenomena—Ancient Democracies—Terms of the Social Problem—The Utopists of Antiquity—The French Revolution and Socialism—Utilitarian Philosophy and Socialism—The Doctrines of Hegel and Socialism—Limits of Economics as a Biological Science—Social Democracy and Materialistic Doctrines—Liberal Writers—Origins of Socialism—Ancient Philosophy and Socialism—Errors of Social Democracy—Anti-Religious Prejudice—In what the Christian Ideal Resembles the Socialistic Ideal—The Conservative School—Christianity and Socialism—Catholic Socialists and Social Democracy—Dangers of Socialism—Catholic Democracies.

II. SOCIAL CONFLICTS OF ANTIQUITY AND MODERN SOCIALISM, - 32

Ancient Socialism never existed—Social Equality, according to the Philosophers of Antiquity—No Trace of Real Socialistic Doctrines in the Social Conflicts of Antiquity—Collective Property in Greece—Aristocratic Communism—Social Struggles and Decline of Ancient Greece—Democracy and the Laws of Population—Evolution of Property in Ancient Rome—Assimilation of Things *Mancipi* and *Nec Mancipi*—The Equites and the Capitalist Bourgeoisie of Rome—Social Economy of the Romans—Joint Stock Companies and the Abuses of Capitalistic Property in Rome—Social Conflicts of Rome and Modern Socialism—Moneyed Bourgeoisie of Rome—Banking Companies and the Roman Republic—*Honestiores* and *Tenuiores*—Slave Economics and Modern Social Struggles—Historical Necessities and Modern Social Doctrines—Contempt of Ancient Philosophy for the Labouring Classes.

III. ECONOMIC ORIGINS OF CHRISTIANITY AND THE SOCIAL TRADITIONS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, - - - - - 52

Social Struggles in Judæa—Causes of these Struggles—Collective Property in Judæa—Rapid Transformation of Property—Mosaic Legisla-

CHAPTER PAGE

tion on Labour—The Prophets of Israel and Anarchical Theories—Jewish Conception of Wealth—The Religious Conflicts of Israel were Economic Conflicts—Social Theories of Jesus Christ and Modern Criticism—Renunciation of Goods—Riches contrary to Religion and to the Prophets—The First Followers of Jesus—Communism of the Early Christians—Historical Transformation of the Economic Doctrines of Primitive Christianity—The Christian Workman—Christianity an Economic Revolution—Early Apologists—Communistic Doctrines of the Fathers of the Church—Communism the most Perfect Form of Social Organisation, according to Christian Ideas—Successive Modifications of the Social Theories of Christianity.

IV. Attitude of Catholicism and Protestantism with Regard to the Social Question, - - - - - - 73

Poor Relief Considered as a *Debitum Legale* and the Teachings of the Church—Contemporary Catholic Socialism and its Natural Origins—Economic Individualism in the Lutheran Doctrines—Economic Tendencies of Luther and Melancthon contrary to Socialism—Luther and the Peasants who Rebelled against the Abuses of the Large Property System—Social Action of Luther—Social Action of the Church during the Middle Ages—Ecclesiastical Tenures—The Church and the Poor during the Middle Ages—The Forcible Introduction of Protestantism and the Development of Pauperism—Influence of the Social Doctrines of Christianity on the Early Writers of the Present Century—Christian Ideal of Right—Catholic Socialism and Evangelical Socialism—Causes of the Greater Importance of Catholic Socialism—The Catholic Clergy and Socialistic Agitations—The Protestant Clergy and Economic Individualism—A Brief Sketch of Evangelical Socialism—Evangelical Socialism in England—The Extreme Left of Anglican Evangelical Socialism—The Followers of Henry George—The Rev. Stewart D. Headlam—The Guild of St. Matthew—Theories of the Rev. E. Symes—Evangelical Socialism in the United States of America—American Followers of Henry George—Evangelical Socialistic Movement in Switzerland and France—Congress of Lyons—M. Charles Gide—School of "Solidarity"—Evangelical Socialists in Germany—Their Activity—The Rev. A. Stöcker—Rudolph Todt—Antisemitism and Socialism—Democratic Sovereignty—The Tradition of Frederick II.—Democratic Anti-Parliamentarism — Harmony between Evangelical and Catholic Socialists—Impossibility of any Action in Common—Greater Importance of Catholic Socialism—Difficulty of an Agreement among the Protestant Churches on the Subject of the Social Question.

V. Monsignor Von Ketteler and Catholic Socialism in Germany, - - - - - - - - - - - 100

Socialism in Germany—German Socialism and French Socialism—Distrust in Liberty—Progress of Socialism in Germany—Traditions

CHAPTER PAGE

of Conservative Socialism—The *Preussische Allgemeine Landrecht*—German Social Policy—Historic Traditions of Germany and State Socialism — The Catholic Church in Germany and the Social Question—Döllinger's Invitation—Kolping's *Gesellenvereine*—Monsignor Von Ketteler—His Doctrines—"The Labour Question is a Stomach Question"—Monsignor Von Ketteler and the Modern Industrial System—Criticism of "Self-help"—The Liberal School and Socialism — Consequences of Liberalism — Lassalle's Productive Associations Compared with those Founded by Monsignor Ketteler —State Intervention and Church Intervention—Monsignor Von Ketteler's Disillusions.

VI. The German Catholic Socialists and their Economic Doctrines, - - - - - - - - - - 130

Bishop Ketteler's Success—Monsignor Von Ketteler and Lassalle—The Meeting at Crefeld—The Congress at Fulda—*Die Christlich-Sociale Blätter*—The Bishops and the Social Action of the Church—Social Programme of the German Bishops—Catholic and Ultramontane Socialism—Christopher Moufang—Economic *Credo* of the German Ultramontanes — The Catholics and "Self-help" — Co-operative Societies of Production Subsidised by the State—The Catholics and *Manchestertum*—The *Christlich-Sociale Blätter* Group—Abbé Hitze and the "Quintessence of the Social Question"—The Duty of the Church according to Hitze—Effects of Machinery—Compulsory Guilds—Hitze's Scheme for Social Organisation — The *Zünftler* Party—Proposals of Hitze and Haberland—Hitze's Conclusions—Hertling—Ratzinger's Theories—Count Lösewitz and the Organisation of Labour—Criticism on Modern Society—Slave Economics—Modern Economics—"Self-help" according to Lösewitz—Roman Law and its Baneful Influence—The Alsatian Clergy and the Social Question—Free Socialists and Internationalists—Winterer and his Theories—The Amberg Congress—State Socialists and Catholic Socialists—Points of Affinity—The Guild System and the Catholics —The Catholics and the Intrusion of State Powers—Opponents of the Guild System—Monsignor Kopp—The Catholic Centre and its Social Policy.

VII. The German Catholic Socialists and their Social Action, 180

The Catholic Socialist Propaganda—Newspapers and Reviews of the Catholic Socialist Party—Father Kolping and the *Gesellenvereine*—The Action of the Clergy—The *Arbeiter Vereine* and their Programme —The Catholic Labour Movement—The Catholic Industrialists and the *Arbeiterwohl*—The *Bauern-Vereine* in Westphalia and Baron Von Schorlemer-Alst—Baron Von Schorlemer-Alst's Social Views and Programme—Importance, Credit and Diffusion of the *Bauern-Vereine*—The *Bauern-Vereine* of Catholic Germany—Their Action on the Agrarian Economics of the Country—The *Nassauischer Bauern-Vereine* — The Catholic Clergy and the Catholic Socialist Movement.

CHAPTER PAGE

VIII. Antisemitism and Catholic Socialism in Austria, - - 199

Rapid Diffusion of Austrian Socialism—Causes of this Diffusion—Antisemitism and Socialism—Maxen—First Austrian *Katholikentag*—Rudolf Meyer and his Economic and Social Theories—Meyer's Programme and Tendencies—Meyer and the Liberal School—Contemporary Economic Morality, according to Meyer—Meyer and the Corporations — The Evils of Roman Law and the Conservative School—The *Vaterland* Group—Prince Von Lichtenstein—Criticism of the Liberal School—Labour as a Function Delegated by Society —Baron Von Vogelsang—The Revolution of 1848 and its Evil Effects — The Triumph of Capitalist Bourgeoisie — Capital and Industry—Urgent Reforms—Success of Vogelsang—Restoration of the Corporations—Austrian Social Legislation—The Social Duties of Catholics according to Weiss—Blöme—Kuefstein—Costa Rossetti —The Catholics and the State — Catholic Congresses—Catholic Socialists and State Socialists—German Socialism and Austrian Socialism—Causes of the Rapid Diffusion of Catholic Socialism.

IX. M. Gaspard Decurtins and Swiss Catholic Socialism, - 234

Socialism and Democracy in Switzerland—Slow Diffusion of Socialism —Socialism and Democratic Institutions—Catholics and Protestants —Monsignor Mermillod and the Sermon at Ste. Clotilde's—A Socialist Bishop—The Duties of Catholics and the Social Question—The Catholic Socialists and the State — Evolution of the Catholic Socialists—Gaspard Decurtins—The Leader of the Ultramontanes— The *Sécrétariat Ouvrier*—Decurtins and the International Regulation of Labour—Decurtins and Favon—The Conference at Bern— The *Basler Volksblatt*—Tendencies of Decurtins—Theodore de la Rive and the Social Danger—Dr. Feigenwinter—The Congress at Bâle — Catholic Labour Associations — The Congress at Olten— Catholics and Democrats—Swiss Catholics and Socialist Democracy.

X. Catholic Socialism in France and Belgium, - - - 258

Origins and Tendencies of French Socialism—Its Character and Evolution—Influence of Marx and of German Socialism—Possibilists and Impossibilists — The Catholic Movement — Catholic Liberalism— Catholic Socialism—The two Currents among French Catholic Socialists—Charles Périn—The Le Play School—Claude Jannet— Father Ludovic de Besse and Liberal Economics—Catholic Socialists —*L'Œuvre des Cercles Catholiques d'Ouvriers* and its Tendencies— *L'Œuvre* and the Socialists—Origin, History and Programme of the *Œuvre*—Count de Mun—Criticism of Liberal Economics—The Guild System—Effects of Liberty according to De Mun—De Mun and Socialism—De Mun's Action—De Mun's Bill and the Catholic Socialists of the French Chamber—Protection and Regulation of Labour—Marquis de La Tour du Pin Chambly—Compulsory Guilds and Christian Economics—Social Programme of La Tour du Pin—*Le*

CHAPTER PAGE

parlementarisme, voila l'ennemi!—Ségur-Lamoignon—Criticism of Capitalism and Industrialism—Capitalism and Social Dissolution—G. de Pascal—Roquefeuil—Bréda— Diffusion of the *Œuvre*—The Defenders of the Free Guilds—Léon Harmel—Practical Attempts at Val-des-Bois—Organisation and History of a Christian Corporation—The Catholic Industrialists of the North—French Catholic Jurisconsults and their Conservative Programme—Catholic Socialism in Belgium—François Huet and the Social Reign of Christianity—Huet's Collectivism—Influence of Périn—Organisation of Belgian Catholics—Monseigneur Dontcloux—Abbé Pottier and the Claims of Labour—Moderation of the Belgian Catholics—Action of Catholic Governments.

XI. Progress of Catholic Socialism in England, America, Spain and Italy, ... 311

English Socialism—Radical Socialism and its Insuccess—The Socialists and the Church — Progress of Catholicism — English Christian Socialism—Cardinal Manning and his Social Theories—Cardinal Manning's Socialism: Reduction and Limitation of Work Hours, Limitation of Minimum Wage, War against the Abuses of Capital—The Right to Labour and the Right to Subsistence according to Cardinal Manning—Cardinal Manning and the Dockers' Strike—Monsignor Lynch and the Right to Existence—State Socialism of Monsignor Bagshawe—Necessity for the Regulation of Labour—Mr. Devas—The Catholic Clergy and Agrarian Socialism in Ireland—American Socialism—Catholicism in the United States—Socialism of the American Clergy—The Knights of Labour and the Abolition of the Wage System—History, Organisation and Vicissitudes of the Knights of Labour—Cardinal Gibbons saves the Knights of Labour from Excommunication—Henry George admitted by the Clergy as not Contrary to Religion—Father MacGlynn and the Labour Party—Monsignor Ireland and Modern Democracy—Character of Spanish Socialism; its Violence and Tendencies—Lack of Moderation in the Clergy—Feeble Efforts of Catholic Economists—Condition of the Clergy in Italy—The Italian Clergy and the Aspirations of the Papacy—Position of Catholics in Italy—Padre Curci and his Social Theories—Attempt of "Christian Socialism"—Padre Liberatore—Cardinal Capecelatro and Monsignor Bonomelli—Other Attempts—Italian Socialism Assumes an anti-Religious Character.

XII. The Papacy and the Social Question, ... 358

Socialists and Catholics—New Tendencies of Socialism—The Latest Congresses—Cardinal Manning and Liebknecht—The Catholics and the State—The Catholic Church and the State—Economic Views of Leo XIII.—Pastoral Letter of the Archbishop of Perugia—The Revolt of San Lupo and David Lazzaretti—Violent Character of

PAGE

Italian Socialism towards 1878—Encyclical Letter against Revolutionary Socialism—Causes which led to its Publication—Leo XIII. and Catholic Socialism—Address of Leo XIII. to the French Pilgrims—Views of Leo XIII. on the Social Question—Vatican Policy and Progress of Catholic Socialism—Progress and Victories of the Papacy—Mr. Stead's Prophecy—New Tendencies of the Papacy—Cause of the Increased Power of the Pope—Action of the Church—Socialism and Science—Socialism against Science—Socialism and the Church.

APPENDIX I.—Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII. on the Social Question. (28th December, 1878), - - - - - - - - - - 393

APPENDIX II.—Address of Cardinal Langenieux and the reply of the Sovereign Pontiff, on the occasion of the pilgrimage of French workmen, on the Social Question. (20th October, 1889), - - - - 399

APPENDIX III.—Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII. (15th May, 1891), - 404

CHAPTER I.

SOCIALISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

Ancient Socialism and Modern Writers—Social Conflicts of Antiquity and Socialism—Socialism and Democracy are Modern Phenomena—Ancient Democracies—Terms of the Social Problem—The Utopists of Antiquity—The French Revolution and Socialism—Utilitarian Philosophy and Socialism—The Doctrines of Hegel and Socialism—Limits of Economics as a Biological Science—Social Democracy and Materialistic Doctrines—Liberal Writers—Origins of Socialism—Ancient Philosophy and Socialism—Errors of Social Democracy—Anti-Religious Prejudice—In what the Christian Ideal resembles the Socialistic Ideal—The Conservative School—Christianity and Socialism—Catholic Socialists and Social Democracy—Dangers of Socialism—Catholic Democracies.

THE modern historians of Socialism, to whatever school they belong, all exaggerate the importance of the social conflicts of antiquity, attributing to them a large part of the programme and tendencies of contemporary Socialism.

In the fundamental principles of modern Socialism we must note two distinct doctrines: the ethical and the economic. The former has been admitted even by the most violent opponents of all socialistic systems, whereas, on the contrary, the latter is still the subject of much controversy even among writers who combat in the same ranks.

Aspirations after equality and chimerical dreams for reconstructing the social fabric upon a juster basis, certainly present no novelty.[1] The history of the East, like that of Greece and Rome, teems with accounts of social struggles; but in the

[1] On the origins of the socialistic theories of antiquity consult the remarkable work by S. Cognetti de Martiis, *Il Socialismo Antico*, Torino, Bocco, 1888.

social conflicts of antiquity, the poorer classes, as a rule, merely claimed partial reforms.

Even those writers of antiquity and of the middle ages, who dreamt of establishing society upon a new basis, did not represent, as do modern socialists, the expression of a real want, nor could they be of the same importance, or believe in any possible actuation of their "Utopias".

And those among the Greek sophists who professed large, economic views, were at best but solitary dreamers, of no practical importance.[1]

What distinguishes modern Socialism is that it claims for all an absolute and equal right to participate in the government of society and the enjoyment of social prosperity. The philosophers of old, even when like Plato they professed communistic theories, rejected the idea of giving the masses a claim to any share in the management of the State.[2]

When Plato wishes to depict a form of democratic society, "whose magistrates, like unfaithful cup-bearers, have poured out pure liberty to the people," and which has become so intoxicated as to completely lose the use of reason, he represents as the height of aberration, the slave refusing to obey his master, and the wife pretending to be her husband's equal.[3]

And Aristotle expresses himself still more harshly: "Certainly," he says, "there may be some honest slaves and women; nevertheless, it may be said that woman generally belongs to an inferior species, while a slave is an utterly despicable being".[4]

It is a mistake to believe that the communistic and democratic ideals are necessarily linked one to the other, and many writers persist, with but small reason, in considering Communism as a derivation, or rather, as a degeneration of the democratic programme. Now, in the old world, and

[1] See the monograph by A. Chiappelli, "Le Teorie Sociali dei Sofisti Greci," in the *Atti* of the Royal Academy of Naples, 1888.

[2] Even Plato considers the masses bound to obey, without participating in the government of the Republic. See *De Republica*, book iv.

[3] *Rep.*, viii.

[4] Aristotle, *Polit.*, i. 13.

more especially in Greece, it was quite the reverse. Communism was a thoroughly aristocratic ideal, and its champions, Plato and Xenophon, were two most confirmed partisans of aristocracy. The Republic of Sparta, which for so long a period preserved institutions bearing the greatest analogy to communism, was at the same time the most aristocratic republic in the whole of Greece.[1]

Moreover, the theories professed by the mild and aristocratic Plato were considered by his contemporaries as mere philosophical dreams; and when, having been invited by many cities of Greece and Sicily to write out constitutions for them, the philosopher beheld with sorrow his plans for reform unanimously rejected, his disappointment was so great, that he had not even the courage to propose their application.[2]

You will remember, too, how wittily Aristophanes, in his *Assembly of Women*, derides the projects of Communism: "'So thou art not thinking of going to hand over thy goods?' 'I am waiting to see what most people think of it.' 'One hears nothing else talked of in the streets.' 'Let them talk.' 'Every one says he is going to deposit his goods.' 'Let them say. Dost thou think that a sensible citizen is going to hand over his property? It is not according to our customs; behold the statues of our gods! When we ask favours of them, they stretch forth their hands, not to give but to receive.'"

The social question (no one, I think, can now deny its existence) was only propounded at the beginning of the present century. "The terms in which it is formulated," says Renan, "are extremely difficult, for on one hand it is necessary to preserve the benefits of civilisation, while on the other, all ought to be enabled to partake of them. Now, this statement sounds contradictory, for at first it would seem that the subjection of one class, and that by far the more numerous, were the necessary condition to the maintaining of society, such as

[1] Compare on this subject the original and erudite memoir by Fustel de Coulanges, in the *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences Morales*, Janvier, 1880.

[2] See Sudre, *Histoire du Communisme*, p. 23. Paris: Guillaumin, 3me edition, 1856.

modern times, and particularly the eighteenth century, have made it. Nor do I hesitate the least in affirming that never, since the beginning of created things, has so terrible a problem presented itself to the human mind. That of slavery, in the old world, was far less appalling, yet it took centuries to persuade men into conceiving the possibility of society without slaves."[1]

In order to form a conception of Socialism, or rather, in order to believe in a rightful and expedient realisation of its theories, it was necessary that the masses should have gradually acquired political liberty. Socialism is the outcome of the profound contrast existing between the political liberties that have been granted to the working classes, and the economic slavery, the yoke of which they feel all the more heavily since the acquisition of these very liberties.

Democracy, in the modern sense of the word, is quite a new fact. No democracy can exist where the masses do not participate more or less directly in the government of the State. On the contrary, each of the great cities of antiquity reigned absolutely over its surrounding territory, its colonies, and the provinces it had subdued. Attica, which certainly did not surpass in extent the smallest province of Italy, never probably counted more than three or four hundred thousand inhabitants, nine-tenths of whom were slaves, colonists, or resident aliens, and not only the public wealth, but all share in the management of the State, was entirely in the hands of a mere tenth of the population, dwelling in Athens and forming a real bourgeois aristocracy. The Athenian Republic was simply a bourgeois oligarchy, whose members, or, rather, a small number of them enjoying civil rights, chose for their lord some eloquent speaker, or fortunate general, or unscrupulous statesman, whom they obeyed blindly up to the day they ostracised him to choose another in his place. In fact, as De Noailles very justly remarks, it was a dictatorship of persuasion, tempered by ostracism.[2]

[1] Renan, *L'Avenir de la Science, Pensées de* 1848, p. 366. Paris: Calman Lévy, 2me edition, 1890.

[2] De Noailles, *Cent Ans de République aux États-Unis*, vol. i., p. iii. Paris: Calman Lévy.

Nor was ancient Rome ever a truly democratic State. Even when the inhabitants of Italy obtained the freedom of the city of Rome, this purely civil privilege gave them no share whatever in political power, which was reserved to the Senate and the Army, and never passed beyond the limits of the Forum and the Campus Martius, where only a few thousand persons could assemble at a time.[1]

Even Juvenal, who has so long, and with but small reason, been considered a democratic spirit, was, on the contrary, a proud and haughty aristocrat. Far from pitying the poor and oppressed populace, or dreaming of improving its condition, with what scorn he speaks of "the poor herd of the sons of Remus" (*turba Remi*);[2] that is only fit to follow a conqueror's triumphal chariot, and demands of its governors but "bread and games" (*panem et circenses*); that bows low before the fortunate and hates the proscribed. And how ignoble does he deem the efforts of the smaller bourgeoisie, who bear Roman commerce to the ends of the earth. Those obscure toilers who, with but a few planks between them and death, sail the treacherous seas, are despicable creatures in the eyes of Juvenal. On the other hand, he thinks it perfectly natural that the poorer sort of middle-class beg for alms in the public streets, rather than try to earn a living by ignoble traffic. The wealthy persons most worthy of his esteem are not those who aid the development of industry and commerce, but men such as Cotta, Piso, and Lentulus, who place their glory in squandering "beyond what accrues to them from their birth and conquests".[3] And, consequently, democratic Juvenal considered society well organised when he beheld troops of clients crowding round their patrons' doors, when one entire class of citizens lived on the degrading liberalities of the other.[4]

Not even the Italian municipalities of the middle ages can

[1] See Thomas H. Benton, *Thirty Years' View*, vol. ii., p. 615. New York, 1875.

[2] *Satiræ*, x., 72.

[3] *Ibid.*, v., 110.

[4] See also Boissier, *L'opposition sous les Césars*, pp. 334-338. Paris: Hachette, 1885.

be considered as having constituted real democracies. In Florence, Venice, Bologna, Milan, political power was confined to the mother city, the populations of the surrounding country were reduced to the strictest obedience, and had no participation whatever in State affairs. In many of the free States of mediæval Italy the peasant was not only deprived of all political rights, but in most cases did not even enjoy the simplest civil rights.[1]

The Netherland Commonwealths were likewise nothing better than a most exclusive monopoly of the bourgeois aristocracy. Amsterdam, which held the most absolute preponderance in the Republic of the United Provinces, was governed by thirty-six councillors, chosen from thirty-six privileged families.[2]

Democracy, like Socialism, is an essentially modern phenomenon, but at the same time, a phenomenon peculiar to Christian nations.[3] Consequently M. Paul Leroy-Beaulieu is slightly inexact when he states that Socialism has existed at all times and in all countries.[4]

Modern sociology teaches us that no system has ever been permanent or universal. It is strange, to say the least, to hear Leroy-Beaulieu insist on seeing a form of Socialism—and by Socialism I mean no mere aspirations towards a more or less chimerical social ideal, but a complete economic system, the direct outcome of philosophical doctrines—even in the *bizarre* and Utopian tendencies of the secret societies in China, of which De Carné makes mention in the account of his journey to Mekong.[5]

[1] See F. T. Perrens, *Histoire de Florence*, vol. i., p. 207. Paris.

[2] See article by E. de Laveleye: "La Forme du Gouvernement dans la République des Provinces-Unies," in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15th August, 1874.

[3] Compare Rudolph Todt, *Der radikale deutsche Socialismus und die christliche Gesellschaft*, preface. Wittenberg: R. Herrosé, 1878.

[4] Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, *La Question Ouvrière au xix^me^ Siècle*, p. 6. Paris: Charpentier, 1872.

[5] See article by De Carné in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15th June 1870.

Sir Thomas More's *Utopia*, Campanella's *Civitas Solis*, Jean Bodin's *République*, Harrington's *Oceana*, Morelly's *Code de la Nature*, Tower's *Illustrations of Prophecy*, etc., were, in more recent times, but late imitations of Plato adapted to the philosophical systems of their day, and to the sphere of thought and society in which their authors moved.[1]

To insist on wanting to discern the origin of modern socialistic tendencies among the doctrines of the "Utopists," simply implies ignorance of the aims of contemporary Socialism, and of the causes from which it sprang.

The men who preceded and prepared the French Revolution were the true pioneers of Socialism, the real origins of which we must trace back no farther than the latter half of the eighteenth century.

If the effects produced by the Revolution have been unfavourable to the socialistic system; if the economic liberty it claimed and secured, in freeing property from every social obligation, has but rendered it more unjust and inhuman as an institution; if in removing the time-honoured barriers that made it difficult to amass large fortunes, and placed an obstacle in the way of all excessive accumulation of capital, it arrived at results almost diametrically opposed to its original tendencies, yet we must not forget that the writers and philosophers who prepared it were almost all animated by noble and generous socialistic ideals.[2]

Whoever will but carefully study the theories of the precursors of the French Revolution cannot fail to perceive that not a few of them professed views closely resembling those held by contemporary socialists.[3]

According to the Abbé Mably, whose works, though soon forgotten, exercised a very great influence on the philosophy

[1] Compare Louis Reybaud, *Études sur les Réformateurs ou Socialistes Modernes*, vol. ii., pp. 71-150, 2me edition.

[2] See Paul Janet, *Les Origines du Socialisme Contemporain*, p. 122. Paris: Germer Baillière, 1883.

[3] Beyond Jacobinism Taine sees schemes on property "that still float in a distant haze, though their common object already appears in full light" (*La Révolution*, vol. iii., p. 105).

of the eighteenth century, the evils of society almost entirely arose from the unequal distribution of property, which was contrary to natural law.[1] Equality is the mother of all good, for it produces harmony among men; inequality, on the contrary, is the source of all evil, since from it arise the struggle between riches and poverty, all civil discord, and the thirst for wealth. The natural inequalities in strength and intelligence are not, according to this writer, sufficient argument to prove the necessity of the economic inequalities existing in human society.[2]

Necker writes that hereditary property is "a law made by man, a privilege"; in society it is always the strong who oppress the weak; "now, in society the strong man is the proprietor, the weak man is denuded of all, he has no property". The oppression exercised by the rich consists in their not being obliged to give their labour on the lowest possible terms. "In this combat between the strong and the weak, between property and labour, the State ought to intervene in favour of the oppressed. How is this?" he exclaims, "the sovereign has power to compel the people to expose their lives in defence of the State, yet is not bound to watch over their welfare! is not bound to moderate the abuses committed by capital against the poor!"[3] The Benedictine Deschamps considers that the principles of sound Christian morality ought necessarily to aim at community of goods. We are living in a state of anarchy, consequent on the power given to the strong to oppress the weak. "And," cries the sturdy Benedictine, "we cherish a hope, less chimerical than many suppose, of some day arising from this state to pass to a condition of higher morality, or equality, or true natural law, which beyond all doubt is preferable to a savage state."[4]

[1] Mabiy, *De la Législation ou des Principes des Lois*, chap. ii. Amsterdam, 1776.

[2] Mably, *ibid.*

[3] See Necker, *Sur la Législation et le Commerce des Grains*, vol. xv. in *Principaux Économistes*, part i., chaps. xxiv., xxv., xxvi.

[4] See, concerning Deschamps and his views, Beaussire, *Antécédents de l'Hégélianisme en France*, p. 124. Paris, 1865. On the socialistic ten-

Marat chose as motto for the paper he conducted, *Ut redeat miseris abeat fortuna superbis.*[1] Condorcet says: "Real equality is the ultimate scope of social science".[2] Saint Just holds opulence as an infamy, and according to Robespierre, no one ought to possess more than 300 *livres* income.[3]

Necker very justly observes that political power has always been centred in the moneyed classes, and he asks: "Whence comes this misery of the people, through all times and in all countries; what can be its eternal cause? Its cause lies in the power granted to proprietors to give in exchange for labour whatever they judge fit; in other words, the lowest salary possible, which represents only the strictest necessaries of life. Now, this power that is in the hands of proprietors is founded upon their very limited number, as compared with the number of those who possess no property, on the great competition existing among the latter class, and above all, on the monstrous inequality that exists between men who are forced to sell their labour to get a living, and those who buy labour merely in order to add to their own comfort and luxury. One class is urged on by the necessity of the moment, the other is not; one class will ever continue making the laws, the other be ever forced to obey them. To these widely different relations must be attributed that empire which proprietors exercise over men who possess nothing."[4]

Montesquieu formulated the true ideal of Socialism when he declared that the State "is bound to afford each citizen

dencies of the philosophers and writers of the eighteenth century, consult likewise the two works by Paul Janet, *Les Origines du Socialisme Contemporain*, pp. 119-132; *Histoire de la Science Politique dans ses Rapports avec la Morale*, vol. ii., pp. 635-670. Paris: Alcan, 3me édit., 1883.

[1] Laveleye, *Le Socialisme Contemporain*, pp. xx.-xxii. Paris: Alcan, me édit., 1890.

[2] Marquis de Condorcet, *Esquisse d'un Tableau Historique de l'Esprit Humain*, vol. ii., p. 59.

[3] Laveleye, *Le Socialisme Contemporain*, as quoted above.

[4] Necker, *Sur la Législation*, etc., as quoted above. For the social views held by Rousseau, Necker, Mercier, Linguet, Brissot, Mably, etc., see Villegardelle, *Histoire des Idées Sociales avant la Révolution Française*, pp. 116-159. Paris: Guarin, 1848.

proper sustenance, decent clothing, and a mode of living not prejudicial to health".[1] Chapelier, in his report of the decree issued on the 14th June, 1791, writes that the nation is bound to supply work to all those who need it, and to assist the infirm.[2] And the Convention fully sanctioned this principle when it decreed that "public relief is a sacred duty; society owes a living to its less fortunate members, either by procuring them employment or by assuring the means of sustenance to all those who are unfit for work".[3]

Yet whatever may have been the economic and social results of the French Revolution, there can be no denying that the greater part of the men who prepared it and carried it out had already foreseen the problems of modern Socialism.

The doctrines of the Liberal school seem to be, and most certainly are, in open contradiction to those of Socialism, yet they have, notwithstanding this, exercised a great influence on the early development of socialistic ideas.

The socialist deputy, Bebel, thus apostrophised the Liberals in one of the sittings of the Reichstag: "We are your disciples, and have but popularised your doctrines, the natural conclusions of which we have taught the people to draw for themselves".[4] The Utilitarianism of Ricardo, Senior, Stuart Mill, Bastiat, Rossi, Dunoyer, etc., carried to its ultimate consequences, has produced Socialism, for when *utility* alone was given as the basis of all economic morality, the masses spontaneously drew certain conclusions, the exaggeration of which has led to Socialism.[5]

The utilitarian theories of Bentham and Stuart Mill, when

[1] Montesquieu, *Esprit des Lois*, book xxiii., chap. xxix.

[2] See Claude Jannet, *Le Socialisme d'État et la Réforme Sociale*, p. 4. Paris: Plon, 2me edit.

[3] *Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme*, art. xxi.

[4] See Abbé Winterer, *Discours Prononcé au Congrès Social de Liége, le 6 Septembre*, 1887, p. 4. Rixheim: A. Sutter, 1887.

[5] Concerning the influence of Liberal writers on Socialism, see Hervé Bazin, *Les Trois Écoles en Économie Politique*, p. 32. Paris: Balitout, 1880. Also C. Perrin, "Coup-d'œil sur les Doctrines Économiques Depuis un Siècle," in the *Revue Catholique* of Louvain, p. 361, 1870.

applied with strict logic, lead either to Absolutism on the one hand, or to the most rabid Communism on the other, and although they both aim at establishing freedom of conscience as well as political liberty, it is nevertheless undeniable that the ultimate consequences of their theories have the same tendency even in religious matters.

If English Protestants were at one time convinced of the utility of suppressing the Irish Catholics, were they not perfectly logical from the utilitarian point of view, since they started from the principle that spiritual or heavenly utility is far superior to earthly utility? And again, by means of the same system, Hobbes arrived at the conclusion that the sovereign had full right to decide even in matters of religion.

If you simply divest the theories of Stuart Mill of certain considerations that frequently clash with his utilitarian principles, you will at once perceive that utilitarian and communistic morality are after all one and the same thing. For as right is but "a power that society is interested in granting to individuals," there can be no valid reason why the State should not act as arbitrator in all questions of right of property.

In his *Programme of the Land Tenure Reform Association*, Stuart Mill goes so far as to admit that if the State ought to leave the revenue of labour and capital intact, it has both the right and the obligation to limit the means of natural monopoly, that is to say, the revenue derived from the soil properly so called, by means of a tax on all landed property. Such a tax would restore to society that share in individual property to which it has a legitimate claim.

When Stuart Mill seeks to justify the right of property, he is forced to adduce reasons of a juridical and moral nature which have nothing in common with his utilitarian views.

Now, what wonder if English socialists have profited by doctrines which the Liberal utilitarian school refused to follow up to their ultimate logical conclusions?

Whoever carefully studies their writings, perceives at once that they but repeat theories which the Liberal school very often professed and still professes.

Owen was undoubtedly the most coherent of Bentham's disciples.

As English socialists for the most part adopt utilitarian doctrines, the early German socialists accepted instead the greater part of the theories of Hegel, and, generally speaking, the doctrines held by the jurisconsults of the noted fatalistic school.

According to Savigny and Thibaut there exists no imprescriptible or inalienable right. Each right is but a power consolidated by time, the accumulated strength of generations.[1]

"Man," says Hegel, "is beyond all doubt an end in himself, and should be respected as such by the individual, not with regard to the State, for the State is his substance."[2] Thus individual morality differs from political morality, and just actions are those in which individual spirit identifies itself with the spirit of the nation.

"In man's world, as in the animal world," writes Schopenhauer, "it is might, not right, that governs. . . . Right is but the measure of each one's strength."[3]

"What do I care for right?" then adds Max Stirner. "I have no need of it. I possess and enjoy all I can win by strength. As to that which I cannot obtain possession of, I renounce it, nor do I seek to console myself by boasting of my indefeasible right."[4]

The consequence of this fatalistic theory, so deeply rooted in the German character, is that in fact, as in right, victory is ever on the side of the strongest, and that no right exists, but merely compromises or conflicts between contending forces.

What wonder, therefore, if the German Socialists have profited by these doctrines, and are but awaiting the day when the working classes will be organised, and have suffi-

[1] See Savigny, "Vom Berufe unserer Zeit"; and Thibaut, "Uebe die Nothwendigheit eines allgemeinen bürgerlichen Rechts für Deutschland," in the *Archiv für die civilistische Praxis.*

[2] Hegel, *Histoire de la Philosophie*, tom. iv., p. 292.

[3] Schopenhauer, *Parerga und Paralipomena*, p. 203.

[4] Stirner, *Der Einzige und sein Eigenthum*, p. 275.

cient power in their hands to effectuate a radical change in the very foundations of right?[1]

There can be little doubt but that the progress of Socialism has been much less influenced by economic causes than by political causes and certain philosophical systems. Misery is no new evil; indeed, it shows a tendency to diminish. That which renders the working man more discontented now-a-days than he formerly was, is the consciousness of his misery. Up to the end of the last century he did not dare rebel against his condition, but little by little, as he has acquired political liberties, he has felt more keenly the necessity for his winning economic independence as well. Without, however, attempting to deny the existence of the evil of misery, we must admit that it has not intensified; the people have simply become conscious of it. The misery of the working-classes, which daily tends to diminish, is now, as economic science proves, much less intense than it has ever been. And if, at the present day, the cries of suffering rise more clamorously than ever, it means that the evil is now become subjective, whereas it had hitherto been purely objective.

Yet we are bound to admit that, if industrial and commercial liberty have saved us from the terrible famines of past centuries,[2] they have not on this account rendered the workman's position less insecure. Socialists are, therefore, unjust and at fault in asserting that the workman's condition is now much worse than in former times. It is rather that the workman has now acquired consciousness of the evil and conceived the hope of rapid advancement, which the development of modern industry alone has rendered possible. Only two centuries ago a magistrate of Dijon, in answer to the famishing peasants who applied to him for relief, said, with a laugh: "Return to your villages; behold, spring is come! the grass

[1] On the results of utilitarian doctrines in England and their fatalistic tendency in Germany, see A. Fouillée, *L'Idée Moderne du Droit.* Paris: Hachette, 1878. Also Guyau, *La Morale Anglaise Contemporaine.* Paris: Baillière, 1879.

[2] *Vide* Frédéric Passy, *L'Industrie Humaine*, p. 22. Paris: Hachette. 1868.

is beginning to sprout!"[1] The industrial organisation of the middle ages has been lauded beyond its merits, and the old corporations or guilds, so opposed to the tendencies and progress of modern industry, are now judged with excessive optimism by those writers who deplore the evils of the present industrial system.[2]

All these evocations of the past are much less due to the intrinsic excellence of institutions which had already become detrimental or useless at the period of their abolition, than to distrust in the modern systems, and in that liberty which, after having been won in defiance of so many obstacles, does not give the results which the inexperience of the masses had led them to expect from it.

Yet it cannot be denied that the rapidity of commercial exchange, the instability of industry, competition, the crises arising from over-production, etc., have rendered our age far more uncertain, and the worker's position far more insecure. In the middle ages the condition of the workman, if humble, was at least secure. He was protected against competition by trades privileges, nor were there ever strikes or crises. His business was small and his customers few, but at least they were always the same. In the guilds, of which too much good and too much evil has alike been said, he at least found a bulwark and protection. There was no intermediary between the workman and his customers, and class privilege served also as a check on the power of capital. The Breton country gentleman, who lived almost in penury, and was not even sure of his supper every evening, was little more than a pauper; yet not even in his greatest misery would he have allowed a

[1] See the "Discours prononcé par M. Frédéric Passy" in the *Discussion du Projet de Loi rélatif à la création des Syndicats Professionnels* (p. 22), in the sitting of the 16th June, 1883. Paris: Printing Office of the *Journal Officiel*, 1883.

[2] See the learned work by P. Hubert Valleroux, *Les Corporations d'Arts et Métiers et les Syndicats Professionnels en France et à l'Étranger*, in 8o (Paris: Guillaumin); the article by Chabrol, "Les Ouvriers Allemands," in the *Correspondant*, August, 1864; the monograph by Le Play in the *Ouvriers Européens*, vol. v., etc.

wealthy peasant to pass before him, and in the provincial assemblies he was always the first to speak, his head high and his hat on. At the present day, under the democratic *régime* these barriers have been swept away in almost all European States, the power of wealth has increased, and capital no longer meets any obstacles to its expansion. Production is multiplied even wages are higher, but the workman's condition, instead of improving, has become more unstable. His wages, always uncertain and variable, always subject to crises and the laws of competition, become more and more a mere commodity subordinate to the daily fluctuations of the labour market.

Socialism arose as a protest against the capitalistic organisation of contemporary society. In granting universal suffrage, which is now adopted in almost all the more important states, we have, as Laveleye remarks, said to the masses: "You are the arbiters of the State".[1] But, at the same time, by our industrial organisation, we have reduced the workman's labour to the level of a ware, the value of which is variable and uncertain.

"Production," writes a distinguished English economist, "has been stimulated beyond the expectations of the most sanguine; still, however, so far as the labourer is concerned, the age of golden plenty seems as remote as ever, and in the humble homes of the poor a no less constant war has to be waged against penury and want. From the bitter disappointment thus engendered there has not unnaturally arisen a feeling of deep distrust of the fundamental principles on which society is based."[2]

Besides this, the workman is even now excluded from political power, to the exercise of which he is entitled by the franchise, widely extended, as in Italy, or universal, as in France, Germany and Belgium.

"During the ages of slavery," writes Loria, "it was precisely the workman's juridical position that excluded him from

[1] Laveleye, *Le Socialisme Contemporain*, p. xxxiv.

[2] *Essays and Lectures on Social and Political Subjects*, p. 4, by Professor Henry Fawcett and Millicent Garrett Fawcett. London, 1872.

all participation in the governing of the State; now, in the age of high wages, and notwithstanding that the right to vote has become general, this exclusion is systematically assured by the reduction of wages to a minimum which subjects the worker's vote to the arbitration of capital. But whatever the process, the result is the same, *i.e.*, a political monopoly exercised by the proprietor class."[1]

Economists have as a rule committed the grave error of giving much more consideration to production than to the individual, and consequently, of rejecting a not indifferent part of the teachings of philosophy and modern sociology.

Unlike most of the positive sciences, political economy has a very limited field of action, and its laws can only have importance under certain stated conditions of society. Nothing in the whole universe can elude the laws of attraction and gravitation and the other natural laws determined by science. On the contrary, the economic laws most generally accepted are only applicable to certain forms of society. Modern economics teaches us the laws that govern certain given forms of society, as, for instance, those adopted by the peoples whose civilisation is of Greco-Latin origin, but it tells us nothing of the earliest or the ultimate degrees of human evolution. There are forms of social organisation which political economy blindly rejects, yet which in many cases have actually existed. We have examples of societies that practised Communism in its purest form, eliminating even the law of supply and demand, as under the Incas of Peru: and, moreover, without having recourse to ancient civilisation or to barbaric forms of society, we may cite other instances that are more striking and more recent. The middle age, with its close guilds, its serfdom, its strict regulations of labour, etc., was based on principles diametrically opposed to those of modern economy. The fact that certain social forms have existed, lasting over long periods of time, proves that they were possible, and that humanity can adapt itself even to conditions that economic science rejects. Now, if this can have happened in the past, we have not the

[1] A. Loria, *La Teoria Economica della Costituzione Politica*, p. 14. Turin, 1886.

experience of the future to sanction our declaring that it may not again occur, and that future social organisms, now unforeseen by economic science, may not develop.

A naturalist who has seen a caterpillar, but has not assisted at its transformation, can foresee neither the chrysalis nor the butterfly. So it is in sociology. We cannot found a certitude on the observation of one isolated fact, especially if that fact concerns an individual whose evolution is yet incomplete.[1]

Though Communism is contrary to all our tendencies, and constitutes a social form absolutely opposed to all the laws of social economy, it has, however, been possible for it to exist and to last over a long period.[2]

Consequently, if the actual state of the science is taken into consideration, modern economists can have no right in excluding *a priori* the possibility that the future may reserve for us, after a prolonged evolution, new forms of organisation, which at present we can neither foresee nor define.

Whoever has calmly studied the various transformations of property must perceive that this institution has been slowly undergoing gradual modifications, and that, like all social phenomena, it has not escaped the laws of evolution. Among the savage hordes of primitive ages, who lived solely on the fruits of the chase, property was limited to a few rude arms, utensils and ornaments, which the owner generally carried with him to the tomb. Next came primitive industrial property, consisting in objects fashioned by the individual; then property consisting in objects stolen, or won in combat,

[1] See Naquet's article in the *Revue Bleue*, 9th April, 1887; also my study on the "Scuole Economiche" in the review *La Scuola Positiva*, 1891, Nos. 9-10.

[2] See L. Morgan, "Houses and House Life of the American Aborigines," in the *Reports of the Smithsonian Institution*, p. 136, 1881; Wilkes, *Narrative*, vol. v.; Cook, *Hist. Univ. Roy.*, vol. vi., p. 194; Rodiguez, *Derniers Sauvages*, p. 158; G. de la Vega, *Histoire des Incas*, vol. i., pp. 224, 232; Prescott, *Conquest of Peru*, vol. i., pp. 30-58; Hume, *History of England*, chap. xlvi.; Forgues, "La vie des Afghans," in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Oct., 1863; Roscher, *System der Volkswirthschaft*, vol. ii., p. 190; James Mill, *History of India*, vol. i., p. 143; Langesthal. *Geschichte der deutschen Landwirthschaft*, vol. i., p. 12.

women carried off from neighbouring tribes, slaves taken in war, etc. Agriculture, the beginnings of which were uncertain and extremely limited, developed but slowly, for the *clan*, collectively taken, attached but slight importance to it. The taming of certain animals that might stray, be exchanged, or made to increase in number, gave rise to the first essays in commerce. These domesticated animals soon became objects of exchange, and were utilised for agricultural labour. The chase, which had been the only means of sustenance, gradually gave place to agriculture and the pastoral arts. At an early stage the flocks were kept separate in common pastures, but the tendency to Individualism eventually brought about the division of the pasture lands. Recourse was then had to periodical divisions of the soil, the usufruct of which was allotted to each family or tribe for a stated time. Little by little these divisions became less frequent, till finally they also disappeared, to make way for family or tribal property. The possession of the land, from being temporary, gradually became definitive, and inequality of fortune, favoured by the progress of industry and commerce, grew to enormous proportions. The origins of property have been almost identical in all countries and among all nations. Thus in the Greco-Latin races, among which the great fortunes monopolised all political power, the elimination of the weak by the strong, the consequence of biological selection, was gradually replaced by the so-called selection by wealth, in virtue of which victory more frequently fell to the share of the economically strong than to those who were intellectually the fittest.

In Greece and Ancient Rome, during the period of decline, when all wealth was accumulated into a few hands, social dissolution was the result of the excessive amassing of capital. Ancient history clearly proves that all the civilised peoples of old fell through the same cause. "Of all the civilisations that have arisen and flourished, there remain but those that have been arrested in their development and our own, which is not yet as old as were the pyramids when Abraham looked upon them."[1]

[1] Henry George. *Progress and Poverty.*

Modern property unfortunately is for the most part unchecked by any social duties, and the *jus utendi et abutendi re sua*, which formed the basis of the Roman land-law, is still the fundamental basis of nearly all our codes. Never before had the State assured by every means, as it has at the present day, the full enjoyment of property, yet never has it exacted less of property.

If up to the present the labouring classes have been resigned to their condition, it is merely because they have not yet been able to secure any kind of participation in political power. In a form of society composed solely of master and slave, the latter could not aspire to economic equality, since he considered himself as naturally unequal, and the civil laws sanctioned this inequality.

Antiquity and the middle ages were undoubtedly troubled by social conflicts, but these conflicts, excited by honest or by perverse minds, by small tyrants, or by tribunes, were invariably but partial attempts, of limited significance.

Aspirations towards economic equality are the result of civil and political equality. The various schools of modern Socialism start with the principle that the perfecting of society can only be based on sentiments of equality. According to them happiness is in direct ratio to the distribution of wealth; consequently the luxurious living of one class necessarily causes the misery of the other. Inequality is therefore identical with social evil, and progress, the final aim of which ought to be human felicity, constantly tends to drag us back to inequality. All the means proposed by socialists—nationalisation of the land, progressive taxation, reduction of the working-day, collective appropriation of all the means of production—only tend, at best, to this result. Generally speaking, almost all socialists adopt the principle that labour is the sole efficient cause of wealth, and that consequently wealth ought to be distributed in proportion to labour. According to them man is by nature a labouring animal, and from a society of civilised men, whatever may be their organisation, a given amount of labour should proceed. In other words, the action that produces labour is foreign to the

surroundings in which man lives, and the amount of ability and labour annually expended in any given community is independent of the uses to which it may be applied, which may vary, yet leave the resources invariable.

Now, these theories are contrary to the principles of sociology and anthropology, which teach us that, one way or another, man will never do work beyond what is strictly necessary for his sustenance. Every species of labour that passes this scope, or is remote from it, is only performed in virtue of variable determining circumstances, and the labour strictly necessary to the sustenance of man is undoubtedly but a very limited portion of the totality of labour.

On the other hand, the democratic socialists, in their not unfrequently brutal conceptions of life, very often point out wealth as the only source of happiness, while, on the contrary, happiness and wealth, misfortune and poverty, have no necessary co-relation whatever. The sufferings of the poor are not caused by social inequality, which in all ages, and within certain limits, has been the great incentive to human progress, but by the excess of inequality, and by the fact that, even at the present day, a large number of persons have the greatest difficulty in earning the minimum that is necessary for their maintenance and support.

An accurate study of the progress of Socialism shows us that, though misery has certainly intensified its character, it has not been the sole agent in producing it; the movement is due to a combination of historical and ethical circumstances, which vary from one country to another.

Up to the present it had been supposed that agricultural nations ought to be less liable to the invasion of Socialism, which for a long space of time was considered as a malady peculiar to industrial countries. On the contrary, and more especially within the last twenty years, Socialism has rapidly filtered into the most agricultural States of Europe. Thus in Germany, the classic land of Socialism, the movement has spread, and goes on spreading, more rapidly in the rural districts than in the industrial centres.

Although the Christian ideal is in no way opposed to the

socialistic ideal, yet it remains an undeniable fact that Socialism has principally attacked those countries and persons whose religious sentiments were weak. There can be no doubt that once the masses have ceased to hope for heavenly aid, and have become convinced that there is nothing to expect or to ask for beyond this world, they must feel all the more keenly and potently the need of an earthly life less hard and painful.[1]

In the case of many individuals of limited culture, the absence of all religious belief, and the belief that no human action will receive either reward or punishment in a future life, has led to deep discouragement, and hence to a profound need of attacking with violence the institutions which they consider as the cause of their present misery. Anarchical Socialism is most assuredly an indirect outcome of the anti-religious tendencies that have been so widely diffused among the people by the Liberal school.

The religious question and the social question are closely linked together. Some form of religious belief is absolutely necessary to the millions of human creatures toiling in the dingy workshops, or exposed in the open country; if they no longer hope in a life to come, they must hope for the joys of earth.

"If," as an eminent French writer observes, with much pene-

[1] "It is not in a future life, but in the present, that the proletariat must seek for salvation," says the *Sozialdemokrat*, the official organ of the German democracy, 6th April, 1882. On the 22nd Feb., 1883, the *Sozialdemokrat* affirmed: "The materialistic system alone has permitted us to give a scientific basis to Socialism". And on the 17th July, 1884, it declared: "You idealists may exert yourselves, you may multiply your learned dissertations, social democracy will remain what it has always been, *atheist* and *materialist*". The *Sozialdemokrat* preaches Atheism and Collectivism with equal ardour. At the Malines Congress, Abbé Winterer affirmed that "Socialism seeks to destroy religion, abolish Governments, and overturn thrones. Nor is that enough! Bebel has declared that the wounds of the social body must be left to bleed in order that the contrast between the classes become all the more apparent. *Socialism is the absolute negation of God and of all religious idea.* At the Congress held in Brussels, everything found some defender, except God and Christian life" (*Revue Générale*, p. 727, November, 1890).

tration, "the sophisms of Socialism are now so deeply rooted in the working classes of Europe, it depends in great measure on their having lost all religious belief. No longer trusting in Heaven, or upheld by supernatural hopes, they pursue the only compensation they can discover. Revolutionary Socialism has supplanted their faith, and the more the strength of religion is weakened, the more ascendancy does its importunate heir acquire. There is no means of dissimulating this; it is no less a fact proved by experience than a truth of induction. Once let all religious sentiment disappear, and in the face of the fierce appetites let loose, the sole guarantee of social order is armed force."[1]

And, in fact, among the uncultured masses, a very religion of Socialism is in course of development. Many socialist writers, taking the theory of evolution for their standpoint, see throughout the history of humanity changes similar to those verified by Darwin in the great geological periods of the inorganic world. Hence, in opposition to the opinion held by Darwin and Huxley, they maintain that a condition of human perfection will be finally attained, and that once the great economic inequalities are suppressed, an era of general comfort and felicity will dawn. Taking into no account the fact that all moral and psychical evolution is too slow to serve as basis to any social reform, they give themselves up to the most optimistic dreams.

Adolph Wagner, who is an implacable critic of this social religion, recently relates that while attending a meeting of socialist workmen, he was much struck to hear one of them describe the society of the future in glowing colours, as a time when mankind would be perfectly happy, and selfishness, malignity and violence would no longer exist.

"But," interrupted Wagner, "this would happen if men were to become angels." "And why should they not become angels?" replied the orator. "It is enough to do away with

[1] Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu, *Les Catholiques Libéraux, L'Église et le Libéralisme de 1830 à nos Jours*, pp. 12-16. Paris: Plon, 1885.

the present economic injustices, and all men will become angels."[1]

The people have many centuries of religious atavism in their blood; they cannot abandon one faith without creating to themselves another.

Yet the rapid and inevitable progress that Socialism has made among the populations whose religious ideal and faith have been weakened,[2] must not lead us to suppose that there exists any substantial difference between Socialism and Christianity, or that there is question of two contrary and opposed terms. Indeed, the socialistic ideal presents in the main, if not in all respects, many essential affinities with the Christian ideal.

I fail to understand why democratic socialists persist in opposing Christianity, while they display their attachment to scientific positivism. On the death of Darwin, the organ of German social democracy said—"What is the death of the most powerful of monarchs, or of an ever-victorious general, as compared to the loss of this man? The proletariat struggling for existence will honour Darwin's memory."[3]

According to Darwin and his disciples, progress is attained because in the *struggle for life*, from which no organic being can escape, the strong invariably overcome the weak, who are naturally eliminated. The same thing occurs in animal life and in human societies. And although the aim of human civilisation ought to be the greatest good of the masses, yet this aim should be attained less through following up ideals of reform, than by allowing full play to the natural laws.

[1] See the article by Adolph Wagner, "The New Religion of Socialism," in the *New Era*, February, 1892. On the same subject see F. S. Nitti, "Socialismo Scientifico e Socialismo Utopistico," in the *Rassegna di Scienze Sociali e Politiche*, 17th July and 1st August, 1892.

[2] On the religious tendencies of social democracy, see Karl Roscher, *Die Betheiligung der evangelischen geistlichen an der socialen Bewegung unserer Zeit*, Berlin, Puttkammer, p. 10, 1878; also Jannet, *Le Socialisme d'État*, etc., p. 143, "Socialism is the negation of all super-terrestrial existence"; De Wyzewa, *Le Mouvement Socialiste en Europe*, p. 211. Paris: Didier, 1892.

[3] The *Sozialdemokrat*, 27th April, 1882.

There is no place for the weak at the banquet of life. Now, Socialism and Christianity alike revolt against this fundamental principle of Darwin's system, and in the name of their ideal they declare, instead, war against the strong, and seek to improve the condition of the weak. They thus place their ideal in something beyond the mere limits of state, and impose certain grave restrictions on individual liberty.[1]

At the present day, even eminent churchmen admit that the ideal pointed out by socialists closely resembles, in many particulars, the Kingdom of God founded by Jesus Christ.[2]

And so profound and evident is this affinity that even the most inveterate Conservatives have been struck by it. In November, 1889, the *Association Protestante pour l'Étude des Questions Sociales* opened a competition on the following theme: "Indicate the points in which modern Socialism resembles the teachings of Jesus, and where it differs from them".[3]

And, as we shall see further on, the number of Catholic bishops and Protestant clergymen, who, in the name of the Christian ideal, have defended, and still defend, socialists against the attacks of the Liberal school, is very great indeed.[4]

[1] See Laveleye, *Le Socialisme Contemporain*, pp. 134 and 137; John Rae, *Contemporary Socialism* (London: Sonnenschein); De Lustrac, *Christianisme et Socialisme;* Von Martensen, *Socialismus und Christenthum* (Gotha, 1875, Besser); Schäffle in his *Quintessence of Socialism* (see English translation, Sonnenschein) has shown that Collectivism, which he believes to be the only socialistic system that can now be accepted, contains nothing contrary to the teachings of Christianity.

[2] See the lecture delivered by the Evangelical pastor, De Boyve, on "La Question Sociale, le Paupérisme et la Mendicité," in the *Travaux de la Deuxième Assemblée Générale de l'Association Protestante pour l'Étude Pratique des Questions Sociales*, p. 169. Paris: Fischbacher, 1889. See likewise Buckley, "Christianity and Socialism," *Harper's Magazine*, vol. lxxxiii., pp. 185-190, 1891.

[3] See De Boyve, as quoted above, p. 77.

[4] The bishops and clergy of the Reformed Church admit that the ideal of socialists is far nobler and more Christian than that of the enemies of Socialism. See in the *Travaux* of the above-mentioned Congress, p. 60. The Rev. E. Trial even went so far as to say that clergymen who treat socialistic ideas as mere Utopias are not real Christians. See the lecture on "La Question Sociale, le Paupérisme et le Mendicité," in the *Acts* of the same Congress, p. 175.

If, in the study of social questions, economists have, as a rule, committed the grave error of considering production far more than the individual, Christian writers naturally tend to give much more thought to the individual than to production, and thus the more they approach the socialistic school, the further they recede from the theories of Conservatism.

A Catholic bishop or a Protestant clergyman of large views readily perceives that the so-called Conservative school, in opposing Socialism, avails itself of precisely the same arguments that a pagan of the time of Augustus would have employed against the poor innovators from the East. "I have thought," observes Renan, "that a pagan of the time of Augustus might have advanced much the same set of reasons for the preservation of ancient society, as those employed now-a-days to prove that there is no call for change in the actual state of society. What does this gloomy, melancholy religion seek of us? What sort of persons are these Christians? —people who avoid the light of day, unsociable, plebeians, the scum of the populace? I should be much astonished if some of the fortunate ones of that time had not said, as they say in our own day: 'We must not repel Christianity, we must suppress it. Society stands in the presence of Christianity as in that of an implacable enemy; society must either annihilate it or be annihilated by it. Under similar conditions every discussion becomes a *conflict*, every reason an *arm*. What is to be done in the face of an irreconcilable foe? Do we have recourse to controversy? No; *we make war*. Thus society must defend itself against Christianity, not with arguments, but with *force*. We must not discuss or refute its doctrines, we must crush them.' I can imagine Seneca chancing upon this passage of St. Paul—*Non est judæus neque græcus, non est servus sed liber; non est masculus neque fœmina; omnes enim vos unum estis in Christo*. 'Certainly,' would he have said, 'this must be some Utopist. How would you have society do without slaves? Must I then cultivate my estates with my own hands? Why, it implies the overthrow of public order. And then, pray, who is this Christ who accomplishes so strange a mission? These are dangerous

people. I must speak of this to Nero.' And most assuredly, if the slaves, taking the words of St. Paul literally, and applying them immediately, had established their domination on the smoking ruins of Rome and Italy, depriving the world of the benefits it was to derive from Roman rule, Seneca might have been sufficiently in the right. But if a Christian slave had said to the philosopher: 'O Annæus, I know the man who wrote those words; he teaches but submission and patience. That which he has written will come to pass without any revolt, and through the masters themselves. A day is at hand when society will be able to exist without slaves, though thou, O philosopher, canst not imagine such a thing'—Seneca would doubtlessly have refused to believe him, though he might, nevertheless, have consented to the innocent dreamer not being beaten with staves."[1]

If the socialist democracy of the day is almost entirely atheist, it is less owing to any opposition between the Christian and socialistic ideals, than to the fact that religion has frequently been employed by the bourgeois class to arrest the progress of Socialism among the masses. In consequence of this, not a few socialists have found themselves under the unavoidable necessity of making an ostentatious display of anti-religious sentiments.

Yet, as early as 1878, the *Zukunft* of Berlin, the scientific organ of German Democratic Socialism, reproved the anti-religious propaganda carried on in the name of the party. "The programme of social democracy in Germany," said the *Zukunft*, "asserts that religion is a purely private interest, the origin of which is derived exclusively from the individual conscience. In virtue of its constitution and fundamental code, German Socialism, considered as a political and economic party, neither accepts nor combats officially any religious doctrine or dogma, any theological or philosophical tendency. It remains neutral in all questions of creeds and schools, striving only for the furtherance of its own end, which is the reform of the present economic conditions

[1] Renan, *L'Avenir de la Science*, p. 368-369.

and the organisation of labour. . . ." Such is the letter of the programme. In reality, however, the agitators of the party, when addressing their adherents and the masses in the name of social democracy, are wont to take the attitude of violent adversaries of Christianity or of any positive form of religion, proclaiming themselves partisans of Materialism and Atheism. But such an attitude is in flagrant contradiction with the constitution and declarations of their party. "On the other hand," very justly observes the *Zukunft*, "the atheistical tendencies of social democracy may certainly, through a spirit of opposition, attract irreligious persons," but at the same time these same tendencies cannot but estrange a great number of reflective minds that rather incline towards an ideal view of life, and honour in the person of Christ one of the grandest characters of history, and in the Gospel a pure morality, upon which Socialism may very well found its principles of justice and equity in the organisation of labour and the distribution of the produce of common activity.[1]

The affinity existing between the ethical doctrines of Socialism and those of Christianity is moreover far from being merely apparent or superficial; consequently, many members of the clergy, among those most attached to the Gospel, are often, if unwillingly, drawn towards Socialism by the very principles of the religion they profess.

Dr. Thompson, Archbishop of York, in the course of the address he delivered at the inauguration of the Pananglican Meeting, held at Lambeth in 1889, in which 145 bishops of the Church of England took part, while accepting in the name of Christianity the fundamental programme of Socialism, spoke on the social question with even more breadth and boldness of views than Henry George has ever displayed. And the Bishops of Manchester, Brisbane, Carlisle, Berry, Michigan, Mississippi, Pittsburg, Rochester, Sydney, and Wakefield, who had been charged to present to the same meeting a report on the religious aspect of the social problem, openly asserted that between Socialism, when divested of all revolution-

[1] See in the *Zukunft*, 15th June, 1878, the article "Die Kirche und der Zukunftstaat".

ary tendencies, and Christianity there was not the slightest contradiction, and that though from economic motives they refused to admit the principle of land nationalisation, they declared themselves favourable, not only to distributive co-operation, but also to productive co-operation, encouraged directly or indirectly by the State, in all cases in which it might prove necessary or even merely advantageous.[1]

One of the most eminent English divines, the Rev. E. Plumptre, Dean of Wells, in a very remarkable article published in the *Contemporary Review*, boldly faces the question of the relation between Christianity and Socialism.[2] He believes that there exists a strong affinity between the precepts of the Gospel, considered according to their true spirit, and the theories of modern socialists, whereas the so-called economic Individualism is a most iniquitous and un-Christian doctrine.[3]

Competition, which serves as the basis of our present industrial system, and urges men on to a continuous struggle in all forms of industry and commerce, in all branches of human activity, is also a most un-Christian principle. Its aim is to eliminate the weak, the unfit, all those who have not strength to resist, while Christianity teaches us to defend the weak against the strong, to protect and safeguard them.[4] Com-

[1] See *Travaux de l'Association Protestante*, etc., pp. 121-122.

[2] See the article "Christianity and Socialism" in the *Contemporary Review*, pp. 734-751, Nov., 1889. See also the noteworthy report made by Charles Gide, *Du rôle pratique des pasteurs dans les questions sociales*, p. 30. Paris: Fischbacher, 1889.

[3] As we shall see further on, Monsignor Ketteler and almost all the bishops who have written on social questions, consider economic Individualism and competition as principles contrary to the spirit of Christianity.

[4] See De Boyve, as quoted above, p. 104. See also on this subject the Rev. Samuel A. Barnett's book, *Practicable Socialism: Essays on Social Reform*. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1889. Also the article on the same argument by A. R. Neuman, published in the *Westminster Review*, September, 1889. See likewise, in the *Revue Catholique*, the article by Count Ségur Lamoignon, année xix., p. 401, "L'action sociale du catholicisme et l'optimisme liberal"; and in the same review, année xxvi., p. 10, the study by B. Sarda, "Le Libéralisme est un péché".

petition, *struggle for life*, are expressions opposed to the spirit of Christianity, whereas the doctrines of evolutionary Socialism contain hardly anything contrary to the teachings of Jesus.

As will be shown further on, all the great Catholic economists, as Von Ketteler, Hitze, Weiss, De Mun, Decurtins, hold that so-called economic liberty is an iniquitous principle, contrary to all the laws of Christianity.

Socialism is not a fixed and determinate system, but rather a movement that undergoes modification according to the historical surroundings and economic tendencies of each nation; in this lies the cause of its power and rapid diffusion. It is not circumscribed by any definite formulas, and this very fact, while it daily adds to the number of socialistic schools, endows them, nevertheless, with a wonderful force of adaptability.

However, a good part of the theories upon which social democracy is founded are in open opposition to the laws of social development, and anthropology. If the radical socialists meet with so much success and such rapid diffusion of their views, it is owing to a complexity of economic and moral causes, which vary from one nation to another, yet are to be found existing everywhere. Notwithstanding this, social democracy by no means represents a superior social system against which modern society may not defend itself.[1]

Stuart Mill observes very justly, in his posthumous fragments on modern Socialism,[2] that though almost all socialists agree on the negative side of their systems, it is difficult not to find them at variance as to the remedies for the evil they all deplore.

The efforts made by socialists to prove that the social question is invariably based on the same terms, and will everywhere meet with the same solution, have naturally ended in nothing.

Whoever follows attentively the development and spread of

[1] See the recent and very remarkable study by Schäffle, "Die Bekampfung der Sozialdemocratie ohne Ausnahmsgesetz," in the *Zeitschrift f. d. g. Staatwissenschaft* of Tübingen, No. 2, 1890.

[2] Published in the *Revue Philosophique*, September, 1879.

socialistic doctrines throughout Europe, cannot fail to perceive that in virtue of the law of adaptation they undergo certain transformations in all the countries in which they have succeeded in taking root. Between Belgian Socialism, which now limits its pretensions to demanding the substitution of co-operative societies for the present individual system of capitalistic industry, and of universal suffrage for suffrage based on property, and the German "Socialism of the Future," full of illusions, the difference is profound indeed, and such as may perhaps never be bridged over.

What impresses one most is, that with the exception of Belgium, where Socialism may possibly triumph some day, as it demands only what is attainable, and is led by practical men, such as Anseele, founder of the *Voornit*, Volders and Bertrand, the socialist masses everywhere tend to exceed the theories of their leaders.

Twenty years ago the propaganda initiated by Lassalle was considered in Germany as the extreme limit of socialistic aspirations. The number of socialist workmen who are satisfied with co-operative associations of production, subsidised by the State, may now be counted on one's fingers.

The class struggle and the consequent expropriation of the capitalist middle class, which were the leading features of the Marxian doctrines, now form the programme of German Socialism led by Bebel and Liebknecht.

But already the theories and action of the latter are beginning to seem weak and uncertain, and the extreme *Left* of German Socialism is preaching a new schism, and places implicit trust in Wilhelm Werner.

Those who were yesterday looked upon as the pioneers of the most advanced theories, now seem to falter and to be wanting in courage, as compared to the many Werners, who ever find some extreme faction at the head of which to stand.

And the men to whom even Bebel and Liebknecht seem tyrants will be ever sure to meet among their own party with persons who in their turn will consider them also as tyrants.

In order to assure the publication of his paper, the *Berliner Volkstribune*, Werner was obliged to re-introduce job-work in

his printing office, and having already been condemned by almost all the socialist congresses, he was forced to pay off all his workmen, who instead of working would sing the socialist "Marseillaise," and who went off shouting: "*Down with the tyrant!*"

The tyrant was no other than Werner himself—that is to say, the man who combats with such ardour the tyranny of the present leaders of German Socialism.

And Werner was compelled to appear before a trades-court, where he was judged in the quality of a capitalist master.[1]

The greatest danger for social democracy lies in the fact that every Lassalle finds his Liebknecht, and every Liebknecht his Werner, nor will any Werner be long in finding others who complain of his tyranny.

The Catholic socialists, who now form a very numerous school, with periodicals of their own, and who carry on a most active propaganda, especially in the States of Central Europe, fully agree with all the other schools in condemning our present social organisation. If in their plans of reform they frequently differ from the revolutionary party, whose violence they avoid, they are not on that account less daring or less convinced than other socialists.

The Papacy beheld the growth of this wide-spreading agitation of Catholic Socialism without opposing it or attempting to check it. It must be owned that what the Catholic Church combats in modern social democracy is not the democratic spirit of fraternity and equality, but the anti-religious tendencies by which it seems to be dominated. During the period of its greatest power, the Church of Rome witnessed the victorious contest of Italian democracies against the wealthy and noble classes, for the supremacy in Florence and in other communes, without seeing any necessity for excommunicating or opposing them.

And at the present day the Papacy, unlike the Liberal schools, is much less contrary to the economic tendencies of Socialism than to the anti-religious tendencies by which social democracy seems to be animated.

[1] This fact is related by De Wyzewa, *op. cit.*, pp. 107-108.

CHAPTER II.

SOCIAL CONFLICTS OF ANTIQUITY AND MODERN SOCIALISM.

Ancient Socialism Never Existed—Social Equality, according to the Philosophers of Antiquity—No Trace of Real Socialistic Doctrines in the Social Conflicts of Antiquity—Collective Property in Greece—Aristocratic Communism—Social Struggles and Decline of Ancient Greece—Democracy and the Laws of Population—Evolution of Property in Ancient Rome—Assimilation of Things *Mancipi* and *Nec Mancipi*—The Equites and the Capitalist Bourgeoisie of Rome—Social Economy of the Romans—Joint Stock Companies and the Abuses of Capitalistic Property in Rome—Social Conflicts of Rome and Modern Socialism—Moneyed Bourgeoisie of Rome—Banking Companies and the Roman Republic—*Honestiores*, *Tenuiores*—Slave Economy and Modern Social Struggles—Historical Necessities and Modern Social Doctrines—Contempt of Ancient Philosophy for the Labouring Classes.

THOUGH social conflicts are as old as civilisation itself, Socialism as we now understand it is of scientific origin, and essentially modern. Even a very summary acquaintance with the history of Greece and Rome shows us how those States were agitated by social struggles, never by real and absolute Socialism. When philosophy and science alike considered slavery not merely as a necessary institution, but as one ordained by nature, and when religion sanctioned similar doctrines, the only conflicts possible were such as arose from great economic interests; there could exist no social aspirations, much less social struggles.

Yet the agglomeration of capital, vast speculations, the abuses of the banks, a wide division between the labouring classes and proprietors, the absorption of small properties, extensive monopolies and the abuse of credit, all the identical causes that have combined in producing modern Socialism, afflicted the ancient civilisations of Greece and Rome no less intensely than they now afflict modern society.

The Communism practised in Greece was a species of aristocratic Communism, all for the benefit of a relatively small number.

What we now call the struggle between capital and labour existed then also; the conflict between wealth and indigence was most bitter. But the toilers had no real consciousness of the extent of their misery, nor could they believe in or hope for a more equitable, a juster distribution of social wealth.

Modern Socialism is not only the result of tendencies and aspirations of a more or less indefinite nature—it forms, on the contrary, part of a principle which ancient philosophy could not accept:[1] the absolute and equal right that all men have to a share in the government of society and the enjoyment of social goods.

This does not mean that in the East, as in Athens and Rome, the concentration of property and the abuses of capital and the banking systems had not given rise to most violent struggles that eventually proved fatal to the prosperity of those States and of ancient civilisation in general; these struggles, however, were always partial and of very limited importance, and were not inspired by any philosophical principle or deduction from scientific theories, but by limited and narrow wants. Indeed, the very basis of Socialism was absent in ancient civilisation. The worker, held in a servile condition, could not aspire to economic freedom when the very rights of property and family were denied him, and when, in many cases, he was not master even of his own person.

We have seen that no real democracies ever existed in ancient Greco-Roman society, and that even the so-called Greek democracies were, during a long period, mere financial or aristocratic oligarchies. As we proceed we shall find that social agitations, in the sense in which they are now understood, did not, and could not exist in ancient society.

The Greeks abandoned the system of collective property

[1] Aristotle, for instance, makes scarcely any distinction between slaves and beasts, and considers slavery as perfectly legitimate. *Politica*, book i., chapter iii., § 8.

at a very early period. The ancient monarchical tribes, subdivided into *clans*, with communistic organisations, did not long resist the shock of civilisation.

The *clans* had in common worship, burial, obligation of vengeance, sometimes even a treasure, and some property.[1] When possessions in land came to be divided by families, the evolution towards the individualistic system soon began to accentuate itself. The prohibitions laid down by law-givers, forbidding the sale of land unless under certain definite conditions,[2] and the severe penalties for those who, living in a communist state, did not contribute their quota of agricultural produce,[3] show how rapid and violent were the tendencies towards Individualism, and how vainly legislators strove to oppose them.

The system of lending upon mortgage, which was introduced at a very early date, ended in the destruction of small family properties. In vain did Solon strive to oppose the rich, the *eupatrides*, and to restrain usury. In vain did he seek by means of a progressive land tax to place a check on wealth and the spoliations committed by the rich. In vain did he seek to protect only such wealth as was the fruit of labour. Who could distinguish such wealth from that which had been otherwise acquired? Usury, though combated by legislators, and stigmatised by philosophers and poets, was largely practised.

Real financial oligarchies, guided solely by their own interests, slowly began to form and to monopolise all political power.

Plutarch tells us that at the time of Agis III., Laconia was the property of only one hundred persons.[4] The wealthy classes had hardly any aim in view beyond their own personal welfare, and frequently sided with a foreign enemy. During the Peloponnesian War, the wealthy Athenians favoured Sparta; later on, they supported the Macedonian invasion, and wel-

[1] Grote, *Histoire de la Grèce*, vol. iii., p. 95, French trans.
[2] Aristotle, *Politica*, book ii., chap. iv., § 4.
[3] See Plutarch, *Lives of Lycurgus and Agis.*
[4] *Ibid.*

comed the Roman legions with joy.[1] "From the earliest times of Grecian history," observes Letourneau, "we find a conflict between wealth and indigence, what we now term capital and labour. The oppression exercised by the former over the latter was so excessive as to render the reforms of Solon and Lycurgus both necessary and possible. So great was the evil in Athens, and so advanced the evolution towards Individualism, that the law-giver was forced to be satisfied with mere palliatives, such as the reduction or remission of debts, proportional taxes, the obligation imposed on the rich to assume costly public functions, the placing of obstacles in the way of the alienation of property, etc. He did not attempt to abolish the right of devising by will. At Sparta, where civilisation had still retained more of its primitive features, Lycurgus was able to restore the collective *régime* in its integrity, by enforcing the division of the land, and meals taken in common.

"It was to this *régime* that Sparta owed her great political importance, her power, and the predominance she finally attained. But it is a notorious fact that by merely granting liberty to bequeath property, the Ephor Epitadeus created at one stroke pecuniary inequality and the industrial proletariat, destroying all patriotic sentiment among the disinherited classes. In vain did Agis and Cleomenes sacrifice themselves later on in attempting to restore the ancient order of things.[2] It was still worse in Athens, which was a maritime, commercial, and industrial city, a sort of Hellenic England, where stock-jobbing, lending at usury, and every species of financial speculation soon broke loose, leading to the division of the social body into two distinct and hostile classes, a minority which withheld the greater part of capital, and whose constant aim was to increase its own wealth, and a mass of proletarians who were naturally filled with enmity towards this aristocracy of finance. The sequel is well known. Men's characters lost all firmness, and the old heroic virtues of their forefathers dis-

[1] Meyer et Ardent, *Question Agraire*, pp. 49-53.
[2] Plutarch, *Agis and Cleomenes*, vii., viii., *et passim*.

appeared; the dominating classes postponed the interests of the State to those of their own cash-boxes. Philip the Macedonian came. There is ever some Philip ready to reduce a degenerate Athens to bondage. Later in the day the passing splendour of Alexander's conquests prepared the way for political despotism. And, finally, glorious Greece was nothing but a Roman province."[1]

The civil wars which drenched Athens with blood, though frequently arising from political questions, were, in reality, economic struggles, in which the small free proprietors rebelled against the continual and rapid concentration of wealth. It was with deep sorrow that the orators and poets of the day witnessed this tendency, auguring from it the worst conclusions for the future.[2]

The insurrection of Rhodes in 355, those of Megara in 410, of Messenia in 411, of Samos in 412, and other risings were awakened by the oppression exercised by wealthy oligarchies to the detriment of the masses. The people, tired of economic subjection, revolted, slew the rich, did away with all taxes, annulled credit, confiscated and divided landed property.[3]

The progress made by economic Individualism was certainly not the sole cause, though the principal one, of the decline of Greece. The solidarity of olden times, having originated in the system of collective property, slowly fell to pieces when the powers of State became the monopoly of the bankers.[4]

The religious aristocracy, which for so long a period had governed Greece, was superseded by a financial aristocracy, as greedy as it was tyrannical, whose triumph Solon had unconsciously prepared when he took income as a basis for the division of classes, and whose excesses slowly led to the dissolution of the Republic.

[1] Letourneau, *L'Évolution de la propriété*, pp. 336 and 337. Paris: Lecrosnier, 1889.

[2] See Solon's "Ode to the Muses"; the Sixth Ode of Alcæus; the Forty-sixth Ode of Anacreon; *Bellerophon* of Euripides; the magnifi cent harangue *Against Midias* of Demosthenes, etc.

[3] See Letourneau, the work already quoted, pp. 329 and 330.

[4] *Ibid.*

"The cities of Greece," writes an acute observer, Fustel de Coulanges, "wavered between two revolutions: one that despoiled the rich, and another that reinstated them in the possession of their fortunes. This state of things continued from the Peloponnesian War up to the time of the Roman Conquest."[1]

The much vaunted community of goods in Sparta, of which superficial historians still continue to speak, never really existed.[2] Great disproportion of fortune reigned more in Sparta than elsewhere; and, contrary to the assertions of some historians, up to the third century, that is to say, till the period of the demagogic revolutions, no division of landed property had been effectuated.

"Sparta," as Montesquieu subtly remarks, "was but an army supported by the peasants."[3] And a recent historian of Socialism acknowledges that it required "all the bad faith of a certain set of reactionists to hold up the tyrannical city as the type of all Communistic realisation".[4]

The concentration of capital, the rapid absorption of small properties, and the frequent revolutions excited by the abuses of the financial aristocracy, were the causes which produced in Greece the thinning of the agricultural population and the misery of the inhabitants, and prepared the nation to suffer without resistance, nay, to welcome perhaps with joy, foreign invasion and conquest.

In all forms of human society there exists a phenomenon of capillarity in virtue of which individuals tend to raise themselves in the financial sphere as well as in the intellectual sphere.

So long as class distinctions and rigid monarchies render it impossible to overstep certain limits, and men may not rise beyond the lowest level, so long as there exists no deeply

[1] Fustel de Coulanges, *La Cité Antique.* Paris: Hachette, 1870.

[2] On the abuses of property in Sparta, see Aristotle, *Politica*, book ii., chap. ix. For all details respecting the social organisation of Sparta, etc., see Claude Jannet, *Les institutions sociales et le droit civil à Sparte*. 1st edition Paris: Pedone Laurel, 1880.

[3] Montesquieu, *Esprit des lois*, book xxiii., chap. xvi.

[4] Benoît Malon.

felt economic inequality, nations live on and survive over long periods.

But when Democracy renders it possible for all citizens to raise themselves, yet at the same time the profound economic inequalities existing keep men in a constant state of expectant aspiration, the number of births rapidly diminishes, and the development of the population is paralysed.

The states of antiquity, when governed by a vigorous monarchy, or by democracies based on relative economic equality, were able to subsist and to develop during a long period of time.

But the growth of democratic ideas and of Cæsarian democracy, accompanied by great economic inequalities, destroyed the ancient states, by rapidly arresting the increase of population. When Democracy is not joined to an economic constitution on a large basis, it has always the effect of diminishing population, or of keeping it at stagnation point.

The concentration of property in democratic states is always followed by the anæmia of the nation.

This invariable law can alone explain how the flourishing states of antiquity slowly perished.

"The democratic institutions," very justly writes Laveleye, "have given no rest to men, unless when, as in Switzerland, or during primitive times, customs were simple and the conditions equal." [1]

Even ancient writers intuitively felt this profound truth. "Let us cite," says Polybius, "this decrease of the population, this penury of men experienced at the present day throughout Greece, which leaves our cities deserted and our fields untilled, when neither continual wars, nor scourges, such as the plague, have exhausted our strength." [2]

And Plutarch mournfully adds that at his time the whole of Greece could not furnish the 3000 hoplites, which in former

[1] Laveleye, *De la propriété et de ses formes primitives*, p. 362, edit. 1891. Paris: Alcan, 4me édn.

[2] Polybius, book xxxviii., 4-79.

times the small town of Megara alone had sent to the battle of Platæa.[1]

In Rome the individualistic evolution of property,[2] the formation of *latifundia*, the abuses of capitalistic property, the tyranny of the banking companies, all developed to a greater extent and more rapidly than in Greece, and consequently the social conflicts which for many centuries afflicted the State, and finally overthrew the colossal fabric of the Roman Empire, were far more violent and more intense than they had been in the other states of antiquity.

The history of property in Rome is, in the main, nothing more than the history of the gradual assimilation of things *mancipi* to things *nec mancipi;* in other words, the assimilation of real estate to movable property.[3] Things *mancipi*, according to Ulpian,[4] originally consisted in inherited property in real estate on Italian soil, the slaves attached to rural property, and agricultural implements. The category of *nec mancipi* goods was open, indefinite, and such property might be alienated without any formalities, by simple *traditio* (assignment). So long as this distinction was maintained, it proved a serious obstacle to all concentration of revenue. But when *equitas*, prætorial jurisprudence, the *jus gentium*, by means of countless measures, removed almost all distinction between the two species of property, when, finally, all difference between *cognati* and *agnati* disappeared, and full liberty to devise by will was granted, the concentration of property became speedily effectuated. Then the *Lex Furia*, which prohibited all donations exceeding a thousand *asses;* the *Lex Glicia*, that obliged the testator, under pain of nullifying his will, to indicate just reasons in the case of his disinheriting his children; the *Lex Falcidia*, which assured a fourth part of the inheritance to the

[1] Plutarch, *De defectu oraculorum*, chap. viii.; see also on this subject the very interesting book by Karl Bücher, *Die Aufstände der unfreien Arbeiter*, chap. iv., 1874.

[2] See Sir H. Sumner Maine, *L'ancien droit*, pp. 208, 257, 265; and Letourneau, *L'Évolution de la propriété*, pp. 352, 358, 362, and 364.

[3] Sumner Maine, *L'ancien droit*, p. 257.

[4] Ulpian, *Reg.*, xix.

natural heirs; the *Lex Julia et Papia Poppæa*, obliging wealthy parents to settle a dowry on their marriageable daughters, all rendered the accumulation of great fortunes easy.

But the evils caused by the concentration of property were much less serious, much less disastrous than those produced by the banking system and the concentration of capital. To these last causes the fall of Rome was due, in a far greater degree than to the invasion of the barbarians, or to the dissolving infiltrations of Christianity. If, by placing a feeble check on the abuses of the publicans and bankers, the empire was able to retard its decline, it did not succeed in warding off the final catastrophe, but merely delayed it.

For several centuries the wealthy middle-class, composed of the order of knights and of publicans, placed themselves above the law, nor were the recriminations of the patricians, who felt the power slipping from them, nor the revolts of the plebeians, nor the tardy legislative measures, of any avail.

Rome had originally been a small agricultural State, governed by an aristocracy. When, as the result of her conquests, the riches of the world flowed in, and colossal fortunes were formed, the distinctions between the social classes, between rich and poor, became very profound.

Every time that a legislator or tribune sought to place a limit to the absorption of the smaller fortunes by bankers and capitalists, he either paid it with his life, like the prætor Sempronius Asellus, or was forced to halt in the face of unsurmountable difficulties.

During several centuries all economic legislation in Rome did but serve the interests of the great proprietors. The contest with Carthage was simply a commercial contest. *Delenda Carthago!* was the cry of the Roman protectionists. Cicero relates that the Senate, composed of wealthy landed proprietors, caused the vineyards and olive groves of Gaul to be destroyed, in order to avoid a damaging competition with the rich Roman landlords.[1] "The majority of the great landowners were greedy capitalists. Little by little they expropriated the greater part of the small proprietors of the soil

[1] Cicero, *De Republica*, iii., 6.

a large number of whom they also compelled to cultivate their own vast estates; for, according to Roman law, the insolvent debtor who had no security to offer, might not quit the land he had once occupied. Thus it came to pass that the free labourers were replaced by multitudes of slaves."[1]

The passage from the *gens* to the family community took place rapidly; but during the heroic period of Roman history, family communities, subject to the absolute arbitration of the father, formed small social units, bound together by solidarity and by ties of interest. When individual property began to develop rapidly, and restrictions were no longer laid on the liberty of bequeathing by will, when the increase in commercial exchange brought in immense wealth, and the conquests raised the number of slaves to millions, when the small proprietors, unable to withstand the competition of the *latifundia*, became bankrupt, and the policy of protectionism, which had induced the Romans, in their commercial hate, to destroy Carthage, became the constant rule of Roman economy, Italy was peopled by individuals living in the two extremes of wealth and poverty.

"Economic evolution," writes Letourneau, "invariably goes hand in hand with moral evolution, to which it is absolutely co-relative. Accustomed as we now are to the individualistic *régime*, we wonder at the fierce patriotism that inflamed the citizens of the small cities and republics of antiquity. It was a sentiment inspired by the very instinct of self-preservation. In the bosom of the *clan* and family all interests were collective. A defeat might lead not only to total ruin, but even to slavery. This exalted patriotism was, after all, but an idealised love of property. But in proportion as economic Individualism progressed, the mass of the people became disaffected towards a *res publica* that had no longer anything public or popular to recommend it. The rich, the dominating classes, dreamt only of preserving and increasing their estates. As to the enslaved multitudes, what mattered it to them if they changed masters?"[2]

[1] Letourneau, *L'Évolution de la propriété*, p. 356.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 363, 364.

The over-lauded Roman virtues were very frequently mere civic virtues, and consisted principally in devotion to country, and prodigious valour. "But side by side with these," writes A. Deloume, "there stood by way of contrast, or rather as the logical consequence of these energies carried to excess and become disordinate, contempt of life and of the sufferings of others, which in the case of enemies and slaves was pushed to the most horrible cruelty, and also rapacity, the passion of gain, a worship of riches, all of which were legally and systematically carried to the utmost excess."[1]

The joint-stock companies, which made themselves completely masters of the commercial movement, and carried their transactions into the most distant provinces, were for a long time more powerful than the State.

In countries where aristocratic traditions are most alive, persons who undertake great speculations, especially if not belonging to the classes in whose hands lies political power, are, as a rule, regarded with some suspicion and diffidence. Joint-stock companies, besides doing away with a great part of these difficulties, permitted even statesmen and senators, who were forbidden by law to enter into commercial speculations, to participate in the enormous stock transactions of the publicans, without, on that account, compromising themselves in the eyes of the public, and without in any way openly violating the laws.

Usury was largely and openly practised, not only by bankers and publicans, but by soldiers, politicians, and philosophers.[2] The austere Cato practised usury on a vast scale, and had recourse to the most ingenious expedients to

[1] A. Deloume, *Les manieurs d'argent à Rome—les grandes compagnies par actions. Le marché. Puissance des publicans et des banquiers*, p. 8. Paris: E. Thorin, 1890. On the tyranny of capital during the last three centuries of the Roman Republic see the learned work by Emile Bélot, *De la révolution économique qui eut lieu à Rome du milieu du troisième siècle avant notre ère, et de la classification générale de la société romaine avant et après la première guerre punique.* Paris, 1885.

[2] See J. Marquardt, *De l'organisation financière chez les romains*, p. 64 and following; translated by Vigie. Paris: Thorin, 1888.

get paid by his debtors.[1] Cicero, the well-paid advocate of the publicans and bankers, whom he frequently calls in the most idyllic style *ornamentum civitatis, firmamentum rei publicæ, flos equitum*, while philosophising on virtue, despoiled with violence the inhabitants of the province he administered, realising, *salvis legibus*, two million two hundred thousand sestercia in less than two months.[2] Honest Brutus invested his capital at Cyprus at forty-eight per cent.; Verres in Sicily at twenty-four per cent.[3] Much later, when the economic dissolution of the Republic had led to the establishing of the empire, Seneca, who in his philosophical writings preached contempt of riches,[4] despoiled Britain by his usury.[5]

All the wealthy Romans were shareholders in commercial companies: *particulas habebant.* Almost all the officers of State were also shareholders, and the patricians held shares, though in secret.[6]

From the year 214 B.C. up to the fall of the Republic, the publicans and bankers who formed the Roman bourgeoisie or middle-class, and who possessed a large portion of the immense capital robbed from the conquered provinces, were the greatest power in Rome, and neither the hostility of the aristocracy nor the insurrections of the masses could wrench from them the monopoly of political power.

And in Rome, at the time when the city had attained its greatest splendour, everything was sold with impunity. Jugurtha, the haughty Numidian king, leaving Rome in disgust exclaimed: *O urbem venalem! et mature perituram, si emptorum invenerit.*[7]

Wealth is like the water of rivers, which, if accumulated at one point, must of a certainty spread out and inundate the

[1] Deloume, work already quoted, p. 60.

[2] *Epistolæ Familiares*, v., 20; see likewise D'Hugues, *Une province romaine sous la république*, p. 12, Paris: Didier, 1876; Deloume, work quoted, pp. 60, 77, and 407.

[3] Deloume, work already quoted, p. 177.

[4] *De Beneficiis*, vii., 10; *De Providentia*, letters 108, 119.

[5] Deloume, *Les manieurs d'argent à Rome*, etc., p. 61.

[6] Mommsen, *Histoire Romaine*, vol. v., p. 58; translated by Alexandre.

[7] Sallust, *Jugurtha*, chap. xxxv.

land; if, on the contrary, it is distributed by a thousand channels, it flows freely, bearing life and prosperity in all directions.

When the bankers became the undisputed arbiters of the Senate, the magistracy and the public *comitia*, which they bought with their gold,[1] their tyranny knew no bounds. "The Roman financiers, that is to say, publicans and bankers, were, during the space of almost three centuries, infinitely more the masters of internal policy, of peace and war, than are, as a rule, the greatest financial powers of our day."[2]

In vain did some prætors attempt to oppose the tyranny of the wealthy middle-class. All the revolts that arose against it but tended to strengthen its power.[3] Having the State finance entirely in their own hands, the bourgeoisie were the real masters of political power. There were publicans who made extensive loans to foreign nations, as, for instance, Rabirius, who *credidit populis;* and some of them boasted of possessing more gold than three kings.[4]

The capitalist class slowly dispossessed the small landed proprietors,[5] compelling a large number of them to cultivate the vast domains that were thus expropriated, for, according to Roman law, an insolvent debtor could not abandon the land he had once cultivated, unless he were able to deposit a sum of money as security.[6]

It was when passing through these territories, which usury and commercial monopoly had concentrated in a few hands, that Tiberius Gracchus conceived the idea of his agrarian laws. In crossing the territory of Etruria, on his way from Rome to Numantia, he was struck with profound sorrow. The deserted fields, cultivated by barbarian slaves, suggested to him the

[1] See Laboulaye, *Lois criminelles des romains*, p. 164; Labatut, *La corruption électorale chez les romains*, Paris: E. Thorin; V. Duruy, *Histoire des romains*, vol. ii., p. 73 and following, etc.

[2] Deloume, *Les manieurs d'argent à Rome*, etc., p. 33.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 331 and 480.

[4] Cicero, *Pro Rabirio;* see also the *Satires* of Horace, ii., 1-16.

[5] See Meyer et Ardent, *Question Agraire*, p. 74.

[6] See Letourneau, *L'Évolution de la propriété*, etc., p. 356.

idea of trying to place a check on the abuses of the wealthy Roman capitalists. He wondered, relates Plutarch, that the poor, who had not a shelter such as even wild beasts enjoy, "should go to war, to combat and to die, in order to secure the pleasures, the wealth, and the superfluities of others".[1]

The publicans and bankers, who monopolised all the wealth of the Republic, and were, in a certain manner, more powerful than the Senate and the *comitia*, since, when their interest demanded it, they had the means of bribing these, belonged in great part to the class of knights, *equites*. They were neither noble nor plebeian, but formed an intermediary class, or, to express it in modern phrase, the bourgeoisie of the Republic.[2] The aristocracy of the Republic, who, by tradition rather than by law, were prohibited from taking part in commercial enterprise, did, on the contrary, take part in it, either by organising, as did Pompey, extensive financial operations of a shady character,[3] or simply by buying up *particulæ* (shares) in companies founded by publicans, and thus becoming *participes* (shareholders).[4]

The power of the moneyed bourgeoisie in Rome, which had been very great even before that time, began to have an enormous preponderance in the third century before Christ. It was then able to violate with impunity every law, to such an extent that the frauds committed by Posthumius and Pomponius Veientanus to the detriment of the Republic (B.C. 214) were very nearly passing unpunished.[5]

The publicans were the real arbiters of the political situation. Mommsen, after having examined the economic and financial condition of the Roman Republic, adds: "And who can now wonder that capitalists impose themselves upon foreign policy, if, through mercantile rivalry, they destroyed Carthage and Corinth, as the Etruscans formerly destroyed

[1] Plutarch, *Life of Tiberius Gracchus*, xiii.
[2] See Bélot, *Histoire des chevaliers romains*. Paris, 1873.
[3] See Deloume, *Les manieurs d'argent à Rome*, etc., p. 142.
[4] Mommsen, *Histoire Romaine*, vol. iv., p. 244, and vol. v., p. 58.
[5] Livy, xxxv., 1-3.

Acalia and the Syracusans Ceres, when, in spite of the Senate, they spared Narbonne?"[1]

The demagogy and militarism that agitated the two last centuries of the Republic, favoured also in no small degree the speculations of the bankers.[2]

It happened in the Roman Republic, just as in many modern nations, that by the time the aristocracy had lost a great part of their privileges, the power of money had given the middle-class a dangerous ascendancy in the government of the State.

When the profession of publican, from having been despised, rose to be not only lucrative, but honourable, and when the publicans came to have all the power of the State in their own hands, and could monopolise the public revenues, the Republic fell, from sheer internal dissolution.[3]

Financial companies had invaded all the conquered nations; there were companies for Sicily, for Asia, for Greece, Macedonia, Africa, Bithynia, Cilicia, Syria, Judæa, Spain, Gaul. They speculated in everything; in building, mines, transport and supplies for the army, in the customs, etc.[4] Every company had its *magister* at Rome, to whom the direction of business was entrusted. These companies, though independent of each other, yet formed a compact class, a real State within the State. By degrees the equestrian order was absorbed by the publicans, in whose class were cumulated all rights, all the privileges and abuses of a wealthy bourgeoisie grown omnipotent. Thanks to this association, and to the immense riches they had amassed, the publicans became the masters of the Senate, of justice, and of the vote of the people.[5]

[1] Mommsen, work quoted, vol. vi., p. 26. See also Vigié, *Les douanes dans l'empire romain*, p. 18 and following. Montpellier, 1884.

[2] See Bélot, *Histoire des chevaliers romains*, p. 337 and following; Duruy, *Histoire des Romains*, vol. ii., p. 495 and following; Tacitus, *Annales*, iii., 28; Cicero, *Ad Atticum*, iv., 16; *Ad Quintum fratrem*, ii., 3, and iii., 7.

[3] Montesquieu, *Esprit des lois*; book xiii., chap. xx., *Des Traitants*.

[4] Deloume, work quoted, pp. 488-492.

[5] *Ibid.*

This financial organisation possessed domains so extensive that the proprietors could not have travelled all over them on horseback.[1] All the *ager publicus* of certain provinces belonged at one time to a few families, and the Roman dominions in Africa, comprising a great part of the north of that continent, belonged to six persons only, whom Nero, later on, thought well to have put to death.[2]

Many of the class privileges that had been in vigour during the heroic period fell into disuse; the citizenship of Rome became accessible to all, so that at the time of the Empire there existed but two classes of citizens, totally distinct—the *honestiores*, the rich and respectable, and the *tenuiores*, the poor, low people.[3] Political equality, or, at least, the abolition of the great political privileges, had become quite illusory on account of the great economic inequalities, which were also sanctioned by the penal laws, and rendered the privilege of Roman citizenship almost a derision of the poor.[4]

With its abuses of capital, its landed property system, the privileges granted to bankers and publicans, and the oppression of the poorer classes, no nation of antiquity had been better predisposed than Rome to accept the theories of modern Socialism; yet in the protracted social struggles of Rome it is very difficult to find any trace of real genuine Socialism.

The agrarian laws of Spurius Cassius, Licinius Stolo, Flaminius, and Tiberius Gracchus, were in no wise communistic laws, though so much has been affirmed. In no State in the world did there exist the same respect for property as in Rome.[5] Even the action of the Gracchi proved sterile and pernicious, for the result they attained to was quite the reverse of what, in their generous high-mindedness, they had intended.

[1] Varro, *De re Rustica*, book i., chap. xvii.: "There can be no doubt that the great capitalists contributed, at least as much as Hamilcar and Hannibal, to the physical degeneracy of the inhabitants, and the depopulation of Italy". Mommsen, *Histoire Romaine*, French trans., book iii., chap. xii.

[2] Pliny, *Historiæ naturales*, xviii., 7.

[3] Duruy, *Histoire Romaine*, vol. v., p. 487 and following.

[4] Digest, xlviii., ii., 10, *De accusationibus*.

[5] Deloume, *Les manieurs d'argent à Rome*, etc., pp. 266 and 267.

"By means of the agrarian law, they multiplied the elements of discord, and occasioned serious troubles in the Roman world; with the corn law they inaugurated the most hateful and fatal of institutions, thoroughly opposed to the real scope of the agrarian law; finally, they assured the triumph of the publicans, of the aristocracy of finance, and as effect of their judiciary law, guaranteed for a long time full impunity to the most frightful exactions."[1]

If Rome fell, it was more through the infamous and immoral distribution of wealth than because of the barbarian invasions or the introduction of Christianity; yet, though on account of these enormous economic inequalities between the social classes, she was torn by long intestine struggles, these were not, however, as has been erroneously asserted, real socialistic agitations, nor did Rome ever adopt any really socialistic doctrines.

The working classes, in their numerous revolts against the yoke of the capitalists and publicans, never had either science or religion on their side.

The primary principle of modern Socialism, which recognises for all men, simply because they are men, an absolute and equal claim to political power and the enjoyment of social property, the obligation which the State is under of protecting the economic capacity of workers, and which forms the basis of almost all socialistic schools,[2] could not be admitted by ancient science and philosophy.

The history of mankind is not, as some historians pretend, the history of its *affranchisement*, but of its *education*. To insist on seeing humanity engaged in an eternal struggle with a superior and unknown power, that seeks to

[1] Deloume, work quoted. On the importance and real origins of the agrarian laws, see Rudorf, *Römische Rechtgeschichte*, p. 38; W. Ihne, *Forschungen auf dem Gabiete der Römischen Verfassungsgeschichte*, p. 75; L. Lange, *Römische Alterthümer*, p. 140; Mommsen, *Corpus inscriptionum latinarum*, vol. i., *de agro publico populi romani;* A. Macé, "Histoire de la propriété, du domain public et des lois agraires chez les Romains," in the *Revue de Législation*, vol. ii., p. 36, and vol. iii., p. 1; M. Giraud, *Histoire de la propriété chez les Romains sous la république et sous l'empire*, etc.

[2] Leroy-Beaulieu, *Le collectivisme*, p. 6. Paris: Guillaumin, 1884.

hold it in a state of barbarism, is an error which positive science cannot share. There exists no institution, be it ever so iniquitous and contrary to our sentiments, that does not find its justification in the needs of the people who first recognised and adopted it. Those who would abolish slavery in all countries, and at whatever cost, are strangely deluded. Can one suppose that if slavery had not been necessary it could have lasted so long, that the millions of slaves and toilers condemned to servile labour would have bowed to their lot, if their servage had not been an economic and social necessity which bound them, in spite of themselves, to that servile condition? Ancient science was obliged to consider slavery as a natural institution, since to have abolished it in certain epochs would have led to social dissolution. Slavery became milder and gradually disappeared, not so much through the diffusion of Christianity, as because it had become economically burdensome to society.[1]

How could any real form of Socialism exist in Greece or in Rome, when the most celebrated philosophers regarded civil inequality as a natural fact, when religion sanctioned such inequality, when the plebeians, though still poor, formed a real aristocracy, as compared to the slaves, who were the most numerous, and who, treated like the beasts, ended by not holding themselves in higher consideration than these? Military education inclined the Romans to excessive pride, and often to excessive cruelty towards the weak, and in Rome, more than elsewhere, the slave was made to feel the weight of his abject condition.

The ancients had none of those doubts or ideas with regard to slavery which we are wont to attribute to them. They were, in reality, neither wantonly cruel nor cynically egotistic. It is not true that the Romans, the Greeks, and Orientals, while acknowledging slavery to be contrary to the laws of nature, yet practised it through cold calculation. They simply considered it as a natural and necessary human institution. The very slave himself did not think that slavery was a condition imposed on him by violence, and contrary to

[1] See Loria, *Analisi della proprietà capitalista*, vol. ii. Turin, 1890.

morality and right. Where slaves were kept in great numbers, in the mines, the plantations, the great building enterprises, they revolted whenever they felt that their union rendered them strong enough to do so. But in the thousand revolts of the slaves of antiquity, we never find any ethical principle, or principle of right, serving as a bond of union.

The mildest of philosophers, the most immaculate citizens, did not so much as suspect that the practice of slavery was incompatible with a high development of moral sentiments.

Honest Cato not only practised usury with much perspicacity, but considered slaves as beneath even beasts, and fed them on unwholesome and disgusting victuals.[1]

And virtuous Seneca, who said that servants are friends of an inferior rank (*servi sunt immo humiles amici*),[2] and who, in speaking of slaves, mournfully added: "How many ravenous animals, whose voracity it is necessary to appease! what an expense it is to clothe them! what preoccupations in watching over all these rapacious hands! what satisfaction one feels in being dressed by persons who groan in bondage, and who hate us!"[3] even he could not conceive the existence of society without slaves.

Besides, this slave economy rendered the social struggles of antiquity much less intense than those of the present day. The free citizens formed a privileged aristocracy among millions of slaves, and social disturbances did not arrest or injure the development of production. If, at the present time, a hundred thousand workmen suspend labour, and go on strike, the whole country is economically affected. There can be no modern revolt or contest from which national economy does not experience damaging results.

In Greece and Rome, on the contrary, while rich and poor contended together, the production of wealth suffered no arrest. For even when blood flowed in the streets of the city, the slaves of the adverse factions continued their unceasing toil, and in the workshops and the fields the production

[1] Cato, *De re rustica*, 104.
[2] Seneca, *Epistolæ*, xlvii., 1.
[3] Seneca, *De tranquillitate animi*, viii., 8.

of wealth did not suffer from the effects of political strife, or at most felt them but slightly.

The social ideal of the old world democracies, slave economy, the slowness of commercial exchange, all rendered the development of true and proper socialistic doctrines an impossibility.

Moreover, in the history of Greece, as in that of Rome, there remains a deep stain, which neither the intellectual light of the former, nor the military glory of the second, can make us forget—their contempt for the humble. The humble worker, the labourer, the peasant, in Greece,[1] as in Rome,[2] not only were deprived of the aid of science, but were treated with scorn by men of science and by philosophers. "The philosophers of Greeee," wrote a celebrated historian of Christianity, "while dreaming of the immortality of the soul were tolerant towards the iniquities of this world."[3]

[1] See Plato, *Res publica*, v., iii., 4; Aristotle, *Politica*, iii., 5, and vi., 8; Xenophon, *Œconomicus*, iv., 2; Plutarch, *Pericles*, etc.

[2] See Cicero, *De officiis*, i., 42; *Oratio pro Flacco*, 18; *Oratio pro domo suo*, 33; Seneca, *De beneficiis*, vi., 18; Valerius Maximus, *Factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri*, ix., book v. and ii., 10; Suetonius, *Claudius*, 22, etc.

[3] Renan, *Histoire du peuple d'Israël*, 8me edition, vol. i., p. ii. of the introduction.

CHAPTER III.

ECONOMIC ORIGINS OF CHRISTIANITY AND THE SOCIAL TRADITIONS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Social Struggles in Judæa—Causes of these Struggles—Collective Property in Judæa—Rapid Transformation of Property—Mosaic Legislation on Labour—The Prophets of Israel and Anarchical Theories—Jewish Conception of Wealth—The Religious Conflicts of Israel were Economic Conflicts—Social Theories of Jesus Christ and Modern Criticism—Renunciation of Goods—Riches Contrary to Religion and to the Prophets—The First Followers of Jesus—Communism of the Early Christians—Historical Transformation of the Economic Doctrines of Primitive Christianity—The Christian Workman—Christianity an Economic Revolution—Early Apologists—Communistic Doctrines of the Fathers of the Church—Communism the Most Perfect Form of Social Organisation, according to Christian Ideas—Successive Modifications of the Social Theories of Christianity.

IN none of the states of antiquity, however, did social conflicts last so long, or produce such profound effects, as in that small nation of Syria, whose ardent genius was the means of spreading throughout the world the purest, greatest, and most assuredly the noblest of all the religions of which history has handed us down a record.

The Hebrews were late in abandoning the nomadic state.[1] And, as with almost all peoples of Semitic race, during this first period of their social existence, they had naturally no inclination for agricultural labours or a sedentary life. However, unlike the Arabs and other Semitic races, who left the cultivation of the land to the nations they had subdued, the Hebrews, having exterminated the vanquished peoples, were constrained, though unwillingly, to attend themselves to the arduous labours of the fields.[2]

[1] Renan, *Histoire du peuple d'Israël*, livre 1er, *Les Beni Israël à l'état nomade.*

[2] Letourneau, *L'Évolution de la propriété*, pp. 275-284.

During the period of their nomadic life, the Beni-Israel calculated their wealth by the number of their flocks. Nabal of Maon, who was considered an extremely rich man, possessed three thousand sheep and a thousand goats.[1] Of the system of property adopted by the Jews, we know next to nothing. What is certain is, that when the Hebrew conquerors first began to cultivate the fertile land of Canaan, the development of agriculture was much impeded by a number of severe and minute regulations.[2] Property, however, underwent a most rapid evolution; thus, there is already mention of family property in the Book of Genesis.[3] When the land of Canaan was conquered it was very unequally divided; to some noble families were even allotted entire cities.[4] Family property, however, remained inalienable, and, when in default of male heirs, it was inherited by women, they could not marry out of the tribe.[5] The right of devising by will, which had been neither recognised nor admitted in primitive jurisprudence, was allowed later on only in case of the death of all the relatives, or the impossibility of tracing them out.[6] Nevertheless, family or tribal property did not last over a very long period, and the Beni-Israel soon adopted the system of individual property. The religious spirit of the Beni-Israel, their ardent and thoughtful nature, led them to adopt, even after individual property had been established upon a solid basis, a great number of provisions in favour of the poor. The hireling was not unprotected, and received his daily wage before the setting of the sun. Weekly rest was assured to all, and the very soil had its Sabbath year, during which all that it produced belonged of right to the poor.[7] Very frequently, in the course of the year, the rich made ready great feasts, to which they invited all their relatives and the poor of the neigh-

[1] 1 Samuel, xxv., 2.
[2] Compare Mesnil Marigny, *Histoire de l'économie politique*, vol. ii., p. 92.
[3] Genesis, xxiii., 13, and following.
[4] Numbers, xxvi., 53-56; Joshua, xiv., 9.
[5] Numbers, xxxvi., 6-9.
[6] Sir H. Sumner Maine, *L'ancien droit*, p. 187.
[7] Deuteronomy, xxiii., 15; Exodus, xxxii., 13 and 14, and xxiii., 12.

bourhood.[1] They were exhorted to gather in the harvest and vintage carelessly, remembering the poor and the stranger. "And when," said Jehovah, "thou reapest the corn of thy land, thou shalt not cut down all that is on the face of the earth to the very ground, nor shalt thou gather the ears that remain. Neither shalt thou gather the bunches and grapes that fall down in thy vineyard, but shalt leave them to the poor and the strangers to take."[2] Lending at interest, which by all primitive legislations[3] was considered as an absolute iniquity, and confounded with usury, was severely prohibited. Moreover, the creditor might not treat his poor debtor with excessive rigour, nor exact his debt without mercy.[4] All these prescriptions, while proving the existence of great solidarity, prove also that the premature establishment of the system of individual property had produced great social inequalities.

It was with deep sorrow that the greater part of the nation beheld the development of wealth and commerce, and the importation into Israel of the ostentation of Tyre and Sidon.

The habits of luxury introduced by Solomon were considered as contrary to piety and dangerous to liberty.[5] And, indeed, the strength of Israel, the very basis of its moral convictions, was profoundly shaken. This exterior splendour was the fruit of excesses of iniquity. The noble pride of the free man of former times was gone. All were slaves. There were the rich, but there were also the poor. The eternal struggle was beginning; the old patriarchal brotherliness had passed away. And what was the net profit of the revolution thus accomplished? Jerusalem beheld most gorgeous pageants, and in the quarries of Judæa, in the forests of Lebanon, in the

[1] Mesnil Marigny, *Histoire de l'économie politique*, vol. ii., p. 78.

[2] Leviticus, xix., 9 and 10.

[3] Letourneau, *L'Évolution de la propriété*, pp. 272, 463, 465, 466.

[4] Exodus, xxii., 25. Throughout the pages of the Old Testament we constantly meet the concept that Jahvé is the avenger of the poor and oppressed against the rich and mighty. See Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, p. 108 31me edition.

[5] Renan, *Histoire du peuple d'Israël*, vol. ii., p. 181.

galleys of the Sea of Oman, thousands of men languished, only that a few contented people might be provided with commodious dwellings, and the bazaars of Jerusalem supplied with playthings for the harems.[1] A longing to return to the old patriarchal life, to the system of collective property, seized upon the heart of the people, who keenly felt the want of a better constituted social organisation, in which rich and poor would no longer form two distinct classes.[2] It was this pure and vigorous tendency, this strong, instinctive need of a nation that had been over hasty in adopting the system of individual property, which, during the space of several centuries, agitated Israel, and, preparing the way for the great Christian Revolution, rendered it possible. Beginning with the ninth century before Christ, there daily arose among the people prophets who preached social equality. "The prophets of Israel," wrote Renan, "are fiery publicists of the description we should now call socialists or anarchists. They are fanatical in their demands for social justice, and proclaim aloud that, if the world is not just, nor capable of becoming just, it were better it were destroyed; a most false, yet most fecund mode of

[1] Renan, *Histoire du peuple d'Israël*, pp. 170, 171.

[2] Renan, *ibid*, vol. i., p. 63. At the suggestion of M. Charles Gide, the Christian Association for the Study of Social Questions charged various writers to study the economic theories of the Bible. M. Babut undertook to examine the Pentateuch; M. Tarron, the historical books of the Book of Kings to that of Esther; M. Trial, Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus; M. Minault, all the remaining books of the Old Testament. However, many of the five hundred and fifty-four texts which they transcribed and studied are not of any notable importance in the history of Israelite economy, as for the most part they contain but the exhortations and invectives of the prophets. All the prophets entertained the greatest hatred of wealth; they speak of the rich as the enemies of society, stigmatising their luxury, their tyranny, the iniquities they committed against the poor, with expressions of the most violent severity. See also in the *Association Catholique, revue mensuelle des questions sociales et ouvrières*, vol. xxiii., p. 1, the article by G. de Pascal, "La propriété et la loi de Moïse," and in the same review, année xxiii., p. 134, the study, "Coup d'œil sur le mosaïsme et le Christianisme au point de vue social"; and Charles Périn, *Les lois de la société chrétienne*, book i., chap. iii., Paris: Lecoffre, 2nd edition, 1876. See also Varagnac, "Les origines juives du socialisme," in the *Revue Bleue*, 12th September, 1871.

viewing the matter, for like all desperate doctrines, as, for instance, Russian Nihilism at the present day, it produces heroism and a great awakening of human forces. The founders of Christianity, the direct continuers of the prophets, conclude by an incessant invocation of the end of the world, and, strange to say, they really do change it."[1] The prophets of the time of Christ were also animated by this imperious need which attracted the whole people. St. John preached community of goods; he said that the poor man would have the first place in the Kingdom of God, and insisted on the obligation the rich were under of sharing their wealth.[2]

In modern society wealth is a guarantee of honesty. Now, with the Jews it was quite the reverse. *Omnes dives*, says also St. Jerome, *aut iniquus est, aut hæres iniqui*, and, indeed, this was the conception of wealth held by the Jewish people and by their prophets.[3]

Under the domination of the Seleucides the wealthy inhabitants of Jerusalem had for the most part embraced Hellenism. Luxury and worldly living spread even more with the Roman conquest, and the rich and the nobles openly sided with these rulers.[4] The people, who had remained faithful to the old traditions, consequently included the wealthy, and all foreigners, in one common hate. The aspiration towards the old patriarchal life, taught and kept alive by their prophets, spread ever more and more among the poor, lowly, laborious people. Ebionism, which later on became the basis of a religious sect, was one of the fundamental doctrines taught by the prophets. Ebion (poor man) was synonymous with saint, friend of God, humble, good; whereas "rich" had almost the same meaning as impious, wicked, violent, extortioner.[5] In Judæa the popular conception of the wicked man was a rich, opulent Sadducee, who drags the poor man before the judg-

[1] Renan, *Histoire du peuple d'Israël*, preface, p. iii.
[2] Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, pp. 53-54.
[3] Renan, *St. Paul*, p. 511.
[4] Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, p. 109.
[5] Renan, *St. Paul*, p. 511; *Vie de Jésus*, p. 110; St. James, ii., 1, and following.

ment seats.[1] All this popular agitation and revolt against property and capital arose precisely from economic causes. Religion served to give a noble aspect to the cause of the prophets, who, perhaps unconsciously, were the instruments of the popular reaction against the rapid and dangerous concentration of wealth in Judæa. The evolution of property in an individualistic sense had been so rapid, so sudden, the traditions of the patriarchal life of the early inhabitants were still so fresh, that the people neither could nor would consent to accept a re-distribution of property, which they not only considered unjust, but as contrary to the law and the prophets.

"The code of Jahvé," justly remarks Renan, "was one of the earliest and boldest attempts ever made in defence of the weak and helpless, for it contains a thorough programme of theocratic Socialism, based on solidarity, and absolutely contrary to Individualism."

According to the prophets the just man was not only bound to protect the weak, to do injury to no one—he must clothe the naked, give bread to the hungry, and must not lend at usury, nor take any increase.[2]

So profound, so deeply rooted in the popular conception, is the idea of justice, as to be considered identical with God Himself. Thus Bildad, the Suhite, asks: "Doth God pervert judgment, or doth the Almighty overthrow that which is just?"[3]

According to Jewish doctrines, man is born to labour and the bird to fly.[4] But precisely on this account labour should be adequately remunerated; all labour is worth its wage, as every service rendered is worth a compensation. Consequently, he who defrauds the labourer of his hire, "he that taketh away the bread gotten by sweat, is like to him that killeth his neighbour".[5]

Property is not an absolute right; tithes, the obligation

[1] St. James, ii., 6; Renan, *St. Paul*, p. 11, and following.
[2] Ezechiel, xviii.
[3] Job, viii., 3.
[4] *Ibid.*, v., 9.
[5] Ecclesiasticus, xxxiv., 26.

of alms-giving, the organisation of mutual assistance are all so many charges incumbent on the proprietor as social duties. The Bible makes mention of a great number of just men, who peacefully enjoyed ease and abundance; moreover, Abraham was rich, Job was rich, Solomon was rich. Yet, nevertheless, according to the prophets and to all Hebraic philosophy, wealth almost invariably supposes iniquity.[1]

Born amid similar surroundings, Jesus Christ could not have opposed Himself to the current of ideas which already, for a considerable time, had dominated in Israel. Consequently, without favouring any economic system, counselling even contempt of riches, He divided the views of the prophets.

The Gospel is not a bill of rights, for the mission of Christ had no political character; it is not even, as the Koran, a theological code. It contains but fragmentary accounts of the life and teachings of the Great Master. In all the acts of His life, as in all His teachings, Jesus was a perfect Idealist, and His followers conquered the world by having the strength to renounce it.

Nothing certain is known of the relations that existed between Christ and the Essenians, but the doctrines of Christianity had a profound and substantial analogy with the Essenian doctrine.[2] Jesus held avarice as a capital sin; by avarice He meant simple attachment to property.[3] For him poverty was an indispensable condition for gaining admission to the kingdom of heaven.[4] When, later on, Christian

[1] Compare the study by Henry Joly, "Le socialisme chrétien: Les origines," in the *Correspondant*, p. 55, July, 1890.

[2] Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, p. 102.

[3] *Ibid.* [By avarice, Christ meant inordinate, not simple attachment to property. But is M. Renan a reliable authority on similar subjects? was he really fitted to analyse the life and motives of Christ?—Trans.]

[4] ["Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." (Matthew, v., 3). It is most evident that in saying "poor in spirit" Christ did not mean poor of intellect, as many pretend to read the phrase, but those who are not attached to the goods they possess, and only consider them as a sacred deposit of which they must render strict account. It is this poverty of spirit, not actual, absolute poverty. that, according to Christ, is "indispensable" for salvation.—Trans.]

civilisation felt the necessity of legitimising wealth, the parable of Lazarus and Dives was called "the parable of the bad rich man," whereas, in reality, it is but "the parable of the rich man". "And there was a certain rich man, who was clothed in purple and fine linen, and feasted sumptuously every day. And there was a certain beggar, named Lazarus, who lay at his gate full of sores. . . . And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom. And the rich man also died, and he was buried in hell. And, lifting up his eyes when he was in torments, he saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom; and he cried and said: Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger in water to cool my tongue, for I am tormented in this flame. And Abraham said to him: Son, remember, that thou didst receive good things in thy lifetime, and likewise Lazarus evil things; but now he is comforted and thou art tormented."[1] Now, the rich man is in hell only because, during his lifetime, he was rich and was clothed in purple and fine linen, and feasted sumptuously.[2] And on another occasion, to a young man who asked him in what way he could secure everlasting life, Jesus answered: "Go, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me. Who, being struck sad at that saying, went away sorrowful, for he had great possessions. And Jesus, looking around about, saith to His disciples: How hardly

[1] St. Luke, xvi., 19-25. However, Hochardt, in his *Études d'histoire religieuse*, p. 164, Paris, E. Thorin, 1890, tries to demonstrate that instead of *a beggar named Lazarus*, we should translate *a disciple* named Lazarus. This would give to the parable a different meaning from that hitherto attributed to it.

[2] [Christ had said previously: "You cannot serve God and mammon". Dives had certainly served the latter, neglecting even the precept of charity which "covereth a multitude of sins"; did not Lazarus sigh in vain for the crumbs falling from his sumptuous table, "and no one did give him"? The context shows that he was in hell, not *only* because of his riches, but *solely* because of his useless and criminal life of self-indulgence, which had unfitted his soul for re-union with God. Riches are not iniquity, but frequently the means and fruit of iniquity.—Trans.]

shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God! . . . It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God."[1] And at every moment, on every occasion, Jesus repeats the idea contained in the words of the Sermon on the Mount: "Woe to you that are rich, for you have your consolation".[2] Jesus does not seek to subjugate wealth, but to annihilate it. He frequently propounds the most singular economic theories. Thus, in the parable of the unjust steward, His perfect idealism leads Him even to commend a steward who, by robbing his master, makes himself friends among the people, hoping in this manner to be received by the poor into the kingdom of heaven.[3] Is wealth, then, so contrary to the acquisition of eternal life that thefts committed against the rich, and in behoof of the poor, may even constitute a title to the kingdom of heaven?[4]

Nor did the first followers of Christ, those who were the

[1] [St. Mark, x., 17-25. Jesus first answers: "Keep the commandments," but on the young man's saying: "All these have I kept from my youth, what is yet wanting to me? Jesus saith to him: If thou wilt be *perfect*, go," etc. (Matthew xix., 17-21). Hence the observance of the commandments is alone absolutely necessary for salvation; the rest is not a command, but a counsel given to those who aspire to a higher degree of perfection. In the Christian doctrine, as taught by the Roman Catholic Church, *voluntary poverty* is one of the *Evangelical Counsels;* no Christian, I should think, dreams of taking it for a command, *sine quâ non*.—Trans.]

[2] St. Luke, vi., 24.

[3] *Ibid.*, xvi., 1-10.

[4] [No, certainly not. It would be contrary to all Christ's teaching to suppose He could have commended the *theft*. He did not commend the unjust steward for robbing his master, but "forasmuch as he had done *wisely:* for the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light". Then, the steward did not defraud his master in hopes of being "received by the poor into the *kingdom of heaven*," but into the *houses* "of his lord's debtors," when, on account of his unjust stewardship, his employment would be taken from him. We must not forget that this is a parable, a figurative mode of expression, by which Christ sought to teach His disciples to be as eager after the things of salvation and their spiritual good, as this steward was for his material well-being, and to use riches (the mammon of iniquity) in aiding the poor, which good work would merit everlasting life.—Trans.]

true founders of Christianity, hold different views. In his Catholic Epistle, St. James uses such terrible objurgations and menaces towards the rich, that it is easy to discern in the violence of the apostle the rebellion of the poor man against those whom he considers as the natural enemies of his class; to him, rich is synonymous with perverse and impious.[1]

[1] St. James, ii., 1-13, and v., 1-6. "Go to, now, ye rich men, weep and howl in your miseries, which shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth-eaten. Your gold and silver is cankered, and the rust of them shall be for a testimony against you, and shall eat your flesh like fire. You have stored up to yourselves wrath against the last days. *Behold* the hire of the labourers who have reaped down your fields, which by fraud has been kept back by you, crieth: and the cry of them hath entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. You have feasted upon earth, and in riotousness you have nourished your hearts in the day of slaughter. You have condemned and put to death the Just One, and He resisted you not" (James v., 1-6).

Compare Janet, *Histoire de la science politique*, vol. i., p. 319. Hochardt (*Études d'histoire religieuse*, chap. v., "Les Pauvres") seeks to demonstrate that the word poor (in Greek πτωχός) had two different meanings: the Hebraic, meaning disciple, sage, and the Greek, of much later date, poor man. Thus, while the parable of the "beggar named Lazarus" is but the parable of the disciple Lazarus, the counsel given by Jesus to the young man: "Sell whatsoever thou hast and give to the poor," should be instead interpreted: "Give to the disciples that which thou possessest". Hochardt absolutely denies that poverty was the ideal of Christianity. "Contrary to the opinion of the philosophers," he writes, "wealth was to the Christians an object of legitimate desire, their natural dream of happiness. They entertained for poverty that holy horror common to the disinherited classes, who are necessarily forced to support it" (p. 157). The poor widow who gives her mite is, instead, the holy widow; give alms to the poor should be interpreted, give to the apostles according to their wants. To remember the poor means to give what is superfluous to the Church of Jerusalem. The phrase: your master being rich, received alms, means: became an *èbion* or professional beggar (pp. 159-181). These interpretations of Hochardt are, however, entirely contrary to the Christian spirit, and to all the teaching of Christ. On the social theories of Christianity see also Wilhelm Kambli, *Die socialen Ideen des Christenthums*, p. 32, Zurich, 1878; Roscher, *Die Betheiligung der evangelischen Geistlichen an der socialen Bewegung unserer Zeit*, p. 23, Berlin, Putthammer, 1878; Todt, *Der radikale deutsche Socialismus und die christliche Gesellschaft*, pp. 63-71, Wittenberg, R. Herrosê, 1878; Paul Doumergue, *Le sermon sur la montagne et les idées sociales du Christ*, Le Vigau, 1890.

The persons whom the Gospel represents as being the first followers of Christ, were, generally speaking, poor, lowly toilers. Matthew, the only publican among the apostles, was not really a publican, but a *telonarius*, or tax-gatherer, a simple customs officer, who also, very probably, lived on a small daily salary.[1]

Paul, the greatest, the most ardent of Christ's apostles, conceives, as the ideal type of a true Christian, an honest, modest, laborious workman.[2] For him also the rich man is a parasite, for he formulates the economic law, which was destined to become, many centuries later, the fundamental principle of Socialism, "If any man will not work, neither let him eat".[3]

It is certain that the early Christians practised Communism, or community of goods. But even at the time of Marcus Aurelius, when this was no longer the case, the property of the faithful was but semi-property, for the Church participated in the profits as much as the proprietor, if not more.[4]

Christianity, which had originally been a society of *Ebionites*, accepted the idea that if the rich man does not distribute his superfluous wealth, he is withholding the property of others.[5] In the primitive Churches, the few wealthy persons who became converts to Christianity were regarded with suspicion; the Gospel shut them out from the kingdom of heaven, and the poor, emboldened by the evangelical promises, treated them with singular arrogance.[6]

In the fourth century, Christianity had become the religion of the poor throughout a great part of the Roman empire; the wealthy classes, on the contrary, still remained faithful to the old pagan worship.[7] And the religious conflict,

[1] Deloume, *Les manieurs d'argent à Rome*, etc., p. 171.

[2] 1 Thessalonians, iv., 11; 2 Thessalonians, iii., 12.

[3] 1 Thessalonians, iv., 11; 2 Thessalonians, iii., 10-13. Compare also Renan, *St. Paul*, p. 246.

[4] Renan, *Marc Aurèle*, p. 602. Paris, 1882.

[5] Renan, *op. cit.*, p. 600.

[6] See the article by Le Blant in the *Revue Archéologique*, p. 234, and following. April, 1880.

[7] Renan, *Marc Aurèle*, p. 602.

transformed into economic conflict, only increased the hatred between the two naturally hostile classes.

The rich could not but look down with contempt upon persons who preached poverty and lived poorly. In a proclamation addressed to the Armenians, Mihir Nerseh, while dissuading them from embracing Christianity, asked how they could lend an ear to a set of beggars in rags, who prefer persons of low condition to those belonging to good families, and who are so absurd as to despise wealth.[1] "Do you wish to know in what manner they express themselves?" said Celsus. "Here are their words: 'Let no learned man, no sage, no man of culture, come to us; but if there is anywhere an ignorant person, a fool, a man of nothing, let him believe in us'."[2]

They formed, therefore, a whole people of humble, obscure toilers, following that nation of darkness, the enemy of light and day, *latebrosa et lucifuga natio.*[3]

In pagan antiquity the workman was but little considered; the philosophers of Greece and Rome speak of him with scorn. In the early Christian communities, on the contrary, he began to be respected; a lowly, quiet, pious worker, not desirous of riches, was, indeed, the ideal Christian of the apostles' dreams. Thus, on the tombs of the primitive Christians, the word worker acquires an honourable meaning. The early Christian gloried in living humbly by his own labour. On the tombs we very frequently find inscribed: *Amatrix pauperum et operaria*, *Laborum autrix*, *Amicus pauperum*, etc.[4]

The people sought to win heaven through poverty. The first Christians despised wealth, considering it as the source of evil. When their religious liberty was fully assured to them, they submitted to all manner of privations and injustice. According to the primitive Church, avarice was one of the

[1] Compare Renan, *L'Avenir de la Science*, p. 520.

[2] Origen, *Contra Celsum*, iii., 44.

[3] Minutius Felix, *Octav.*, 8.

[4] Compare Renan, *Marc Aurèle*, pp. 599, 600.

greatest crimes;[1] by avarice was not unfrequently meant simple hoarding or saving. Usury (and under this name was comprised every species of lending at interest) was strictly prohibited, thus rendering any large industrial undertaking impossible.

We are bound to admit that Christianity was a vast economic revolution more than anything else.[2] The first Christians did not seek to acquire wealth; like Christ, they sought to annihilate it. Like their Great Master, they had no conception of civil government;[3] the religious idea so dominated them as to destroy all differences of nationality or social condition.[4]

The early fathers of the Church, faithful to the teachings of Christ, professed thoroughly communistic theories. They lived among communistic surroundings, and could not well have maintained theories contrary to those held by Christ and the apostles.[5] "All is in common with us, except women," says Tertullian.[6] St. Justin adds: "We carry on us all we possess, and share everything with the poor".[7]

It must not be forgotten that at the time of the Apologists the commercial and landed aristocracy was almost entirely

[1] 1 Epistle to the Corinthians, v., 10 and 11, and vi., 10 and following. [In the verses alluded to the Apostle warns the faithful against having intercourse with the *covetous* or *extortioners*, also against *thieves*, drunkards, railers and fornicators. Nothing indicates that he disapproves of simple thrift or saving.—Trans.]

[2] Renan, *Marc Aurèle*, p. 598.

[3] Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, p. 69.

[4] Renan, *Marc Aurèle*, p. 591.

[5] Several critics, as Bergier, *Dictionnaire de la théologie*, article on the "Communité des Biens," and Mosheim, *Dissertations sur l'histoire ecclésiastique*, vol. ii., p. 14, are of opinion that it was always a question of that Communism which results from charity, and in virtue of which the rich man succours the poor. These interpretations are, however, arbitrary, as the texts of the Gospel are more than clear in meaning. [Most clear indeed, and all tend to show that Christian Communism *was* based on charity and justice.—Trans.]

[6] Tertullian, *Apologia*, c. xxxix.

[7] St. Justin, *Apologia*, i., 14.

pagan. Christianity was still the religion of the poor, and gathered around it poor workmen, humble toilers, and slaves.

The official world had not yet accepted the teachings of Christ.[1] Indeed, even Marcus Aurelius, whose ideas in so many points resembled those of Christianity, with all his Stoic greatness and calm philosophy, considered the doctrines of the Christians as dangerous to the welfare and unity of the Empire.[2]

The communistic theories of the first Apologists and early fathers of the Church are, therefore, not only the result of evangelical doctrines, but also, and above all, of the surroundings among which it originated. When, after Constantine, Christianity became, on the contrary, the official religion, and was embraced by the rich and by members of the Government, the ecclesiastical writers manifested quite different opinions on the subject of property.

The doctrines held by the early fathers of the Church on the nature of property are perfectly uniform. They almost all admit that wealth is the fruit of usurpation, and, considering the rich man as withholding the patrimony of the poor, maintain that riches should only serve to relieve the indigent; to refuse to assist the poor is, consequently, worse than to rob the rich.[3] According to the fathers, all was in common in

[1] Renan, *Marc Aurèle*, p. 402.

[2] Renan, *ibid.*, p. 592.

[3] On the social theories of the fathers of the Church, compare Brentano, *Die Arbeiterversicherung gemäss der heutigen Wirthschaftsordnung*, Leipzig, 1879; Roscher, *Geschichte der national-Oekonomik in Deutschland*, p. 6, and following, Munich, 1874; the extraordinary book by Victor Considérant, *Le socialisme devant le vieux monde ou le vivant devant les morts*, Paris, Librairie Phalanstérienne, 1848, in the appendix of which is published a strange study by Victor Meunier, "Jésus Christ devant les conseils de guerre," pp. 226-264; F. Villegardelle, *Histoire des idées sociales avant la Révolution Française*, pp. 61-83, Paris, Guarin, 1846; Thonissen, *Le communisme et l'église positive*, Louvain, 1861; Feugueray, *Essais sur les doctrines politiques de Saint Thomas d'Aquin*, see chapter entitled, "Démocratie des Pères de l'Église," p. 217, Paris, 1857; Janet, *Histoire de la Science Politique*, vol. i., pp. 289 and 301, Paris, 3me edit., 1887; Laveleye, *Le Socialisme Contemporain*, p. xvii.

the beginning; the distinctions *mine* and *thine*, in other words individual property, came with the spirit of evil.

"The soil," says St. Ambrose, "was given to rich and poor in common. Wherefore, O ye rich! do you unjustly claim it for yourselves alone?"[1] And in another place he says even more clearly: "Nature gave all things in common for the use of all, usurpation created private right".[2] "Behold," writes St. John Chrysostom, "the idea we should have of the rich and covetous: they are truly as robbers, who, standing in the public highways, despoil the passers-by; they convert their chambers into caverns, in which they bury the goods of others."[3] "It is no great thing," writes St. Gregory the Great, "not to rob others of their belongings, and in vain do they think themselves innocent who appropriate to their own use alone those goods which God gave in common; by not giving to others that which they themselves received, they become homicides and murderers, inasmuch as in keeping for themselves those things which would have alleviated the sufferings of the poor, we may say that they every day cause the death of as many persons as they might have fed and did not. When, therefore, we offer the means of living to the indigent, we do not give them anything of ours, but that which of right belongs to them. It is less a work of mercy that we perform than the payment of a debt."[4]

"*Communis vita*," says St. Clement, "*fratres, omnibus necessaria est, et maxime his qui Deo irreprehensibiliter militari cupiunt, et vitam apostolorum, eorumque discipulorum imitari volunt. Communis enim usus omnium, quæ sunt in hoc mundo, omnibus esse hominibus debuit. Sed per iniquitatem alius hoc suum esse dicit, et alius illud, et sic inter mortales facta divisio est.*"[5]

[1] Ambrosii, *Opera*, Benedictine edit., *De Nabuthe israelita*, c. i., 2.

[2] Ambrosii, *De officiis*, lib. i., c. xviii.

[3] St. John Chrysostom, *De Lazaro concio*, i.

[4] St. Gregory the Great, *Opera*, Paris, 1605; *Regimen pastorale*, c. xxii., p. 3.

[5] From the *Corpus juris canonici*, *causa* xii., 1648.

For St. Augustine, property is not a natural right, but a positive right, founded simply on civil authority.[1]

"Unhappy ones that you are!" says St. Basil the Great, addressing the rich, "what answer will you make to the Great Judge? You cover with tapestry the bareness of your walls, and do not clothe the nakedness of men. You adorn your steeds with most rich and costly trappings, and despise your brother who is in rags. You allow the corn in your granaries to rot or be eaten up by vermin, and you deign not even to cast a glance on those who have no bread. You hoard your wealth, and do not deign to look upon those who are worn and oppressed by necessity! You will say to me: 'What wrong do I commit if I hoard that which is mine?' And I ask you: 'Which are the things that you think belong to you? From whom did you receive them? You act like a man who being in a theatre, and having seized upon the places that others might have taken, seeks to prevent every one else from entering, applying to his own use that which should be for the use of all.' And thus it is with the rich, who having been the first to obtain possession of those things which should be common to all, appropriate them to themselves and retain them in their possession; for if each one took only what is necessary for his subsistence, and gave the rest to the indigent, there would be neither rich nor poor."[2]

In his homilies, St. John Chrysostom speaks with profound contempt of the rich of Antioch and Constantinople. All that host of wealthy *Epulones*, living in idleness and given over to the refinements of Oriental luxury, find in him a merciless and inexorable critic.

"You received," he says to them, "your fortune by inheritance; so be it! Therefore, you have not sinned personally, but how know you that you may not be enjoying the fruits of theft and crime committed before you?"[3] For St. John Chrysostom could not conceive the existence of great fortunes without admitting that they had been accumulated at the

[1] St. Augustine, *In Evangelium Joannis*, tract. vi., 25 and 26.
[2] St. Basil the Great, *Concio de divitiis et paupertate.*
[3] St. John Chrysostom, *In Epist.* i. *ad Tim.*, 12.

expense of thousands of workers and poor people. In his opinion wealth could be amassed only through commercial frauds, monopoly, or usury.[1] And the richest are always the most heartless, those who drag the workers before the judgment seats, and to their ruin.

He never ceases from stigmatising the rich upon all occasions, and notwithstanding the persecution they carry on against him, by which they finally succeed in ruining him, and forcing him to quit Constantinople, they cannot, however, silence him or prevent him from openly declaring his aversion to wealth. One day, in speaking of the misfortune of SS. Saturninus and Aurelianus, having violently censured the rich men of the city, he exclaims:—"They say to me: 'Wilt thou never cease from speaking ill of the rich? Still more anathemas against the rich!' and I answer: 'Still your hardness towards the poor!'"[2]

The rich men of those times reasoned very much in the same manner as do some Individualist writers of the present day. "The poor," they said, "deserve their lot. They are idlers who do not even wish to work; noxious parasites whom it would be better to do away with. Some of them are simply beggars, who speculate on people's kindness of heart. No," they added, "God does not love the poor, for if He loved them He would remedy their misery."[3]

But to these objections St. John Chrysostom replied with most severe accusations. "You say that the poor do not work," he cries to the rich, "but do you work yourselves? Do you not enjoy in idleness the goods you have unjustly inherited? Do you not exhaust others with labour, while you enjoy in indolence the fruit of their misery?"[4]

An infinity of citations might be given on the subject, for almost all the fathers of the Church, up to the seventh century,

[1] St. John Chrysostom, *In Epist.* i. *ad Thess.*, 10; *In Epist.* i. *ad Cor.*, 39; *In Matth.*, 56; *In Acta Apost.*, 42.

[2] St. John Chrysostom, *Homelia in verba David.*

[3] St. John Chrysostom, *De Lazaro*, i.

[4] See the splendid work by Aimé Puech, *Saint Jean Chrysostome et les mœurs de son temps*, pp. 46-92. Paris: Hachette, 1871.

considered Communism as the most perfect and most Christian form of social organisation.

Usury, by which, like Christ, they meant simple lending at interest, was, according to them, a capital offence.[1] And it was precisely these theories of credit, which, by arresting the development of commercial exchange, formed a barrier to the progress of all industry, and became for several centuries a cause of misery.

According to St. Jerome, "opulence is always the result of theft, if not committed by the actual possessor, then by his predecessors". For St. Clement private property is the fruit of iniquity. St. Basil considers the rich man as a thief, and St. John Chrysostom insists on the necessity of restoring at all costs community of goods. According to St. Augustine, private property originated in usurpation, etc.[2]

Such maxims have, moreover, left profound traces in the Canon Law. In the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, private property is also considered as an evil, since, according to Divine Law, all things are common to men, as air and light.[3]

Similar theories could be received by the Church, when it was but the refuge of the poor, the asylum of the helpless, when community of goods was more or less practised. But when Christianity became the official religion, and was adopted as a social necessity, even by the rich, even by those who up to the last had continued in the old Pagan worship, it became necessary to mitigate the evangelical doctrines on property. Thus, while the discussion over individual property was still waging, we see Clement of Alexandria, in his treatise, *Quis*

[1] Compare the elaborate study by Dr. W. Endemann, *Die National-Oekonomischen Grundlage der canonischen Lehre*, p. 200. Jena: Friedrich Mauke, 1863. Compare also the very remarkable studies by Vogelsang, "Zins und Wucher, Ein Senacat Votum in dem vom deutschen katholikentage eingesetzten social-politischen Comité," in the *Oesterreichische Monatsschrift für Christliche Social-Reform*, May, 1884, pp. 233-257; June, pp. 321-343; July, pp. 345-351; August, pp. 419-433; September, pp. 457-480. Vienna.

[2] Compare Laveleye, *Le Socialisme Contemporain*, p. xvii.

[3] *Decretales Gratiani*, ii., c. xii., qu. i., c. ii.

divis salvetur? strive to conciliate the teachings of the Gospel with the economic needs of his time.[1]

The interpretation given by Clement of Alexandria is a specimen of perfect sophistry, such as could only be conceived in the mind of an Alexandrian writer, and in open contradiction to all that had been written and taught by the fathers of the Church. Changing the meaning of the parable of Dives and Lazarus, Clement says:—"Our Lord does not, as some suppose, command the rich man to throw away his possessions, but to cast from his heart the love of gold, with all those cares and preoccupations that stifle the germ of life. . . . What new thing, then, does the Son of God teach us in this? Not an exterior act, such as many have performed, but something higher, more perfect, and more Divine, the rooting out of passions from the soul itself, and the renunciation of all that is alien to its nature. Man may rid himself of his earthly goods, and yet cupidity and the desire of wealth be none the less active within him; he will thus be exposed to double affliction, regretting at the same time his prodigality and his misery. . . . How could works of charity be performed among men, if no one possessed the means of giving alms? If the teaching of our Lord had this meaning, it would be in evident contradiction to many of His glorious doctrines.

"Worldly goods should be considered as materials and instruments to be used for pious purposes, to be turned to good account by those who know how to employ them skilfully."[2]

Are not these the first attempts made to adapt Christian doctrines to the requirements of the times, and to social institutions? Do we not find in Clement's words the germ of ideas which were to become, many ages later, the basis of Catholic social doctrines?

By the Canon Law, economic activity, like all worldly activity, was considered as an evil: *Negotium negat otium, neque quærit veram quietem, quæ est Deus!*[3] Such maxims as

[1] Compare Janet, *Histoire de la science politique*, vol. i., p. 299.
[2] Clement of Alexandria, *Quis divis salvetur?* cap. xi.-xiv.
[3] *Decretales Gratiani*, i., c. xii

these, which taught that poverty is a holy thing, and acceptable to God, tended naturally to increase the great number of donations made to the Church. During the middle ages these donations contributed greatly to augment the vast wealth of the Church, whose duty it was to relieve the poor.[1]

It was not until the thirteenth century, when the Church was already immensely rich, that ecclesiastical writers appeared openly maintaining the right of property. Thus we find St. Thomas Aquinas endeavouring to conciliate Aristotle's conservative doctrines on property with the Communistic teachings of the Gospel and the fathers of the Church of the second, third, and fourth centuries.[2]

The Church was not only obliged to gradually repudiate its original teachings, but was forced, after long struggles, to exclude from the fold those who obstinately maintained them.

Pelagius, who, in the time of Aurelius Augustinus (St. Augustine), denied the possibility of conciliating individual property with the Christian ideal;[3] the mendicant orders, who denied the right of property, Christ and the apostles having never possessed any;[4] Wycliffe, Huss, Jean Petit, the Anabaptists,[5] etc., did nothing beyond making vain efforts to restore the theories of the Gospel regarding property. If their disputes were almost always of a religious nature, they nevertheless invariably bore an economic character as well. It should not be forgotten that during the middle ages all questions were discussed under a theological aspect. Thus, when the Mendicant Friars declared that Christ and the apostles had never possessed anything, they dealt a heavy blow at the solidity of the right of property, which they

[1] Compare Roscher, *Geschichte der National-Oekonomik in Deutschland*, p. 6.

[2] *Summa Theologica*, q. lxvi.

[3] Sudre, *Histoire du communisme*, chap. vii.

[4] Janet, *Histoire de la science politique*, vol. i., liv. ii., chap. iv.

[5] Sudre, *op. cit.*, chaps. viii., ix., x.; Villegardelle, *Histoire des idées sociales*, etc., pp. 83 and 99.

considered as an evil, and essentially contrary to Christian perfection. We may, consequently, and without any fear of exaggeration, affirm that most of the great schisms and conflicts by which the Catholic Church has been torn, were simply economic conflicts.[1]

[1] [A careful and impartial glance at history will suffice to prove that the motives which compelled the Church to reject the various heresiarchs from the communion of the faithful, were never of an economic order. Such measures were invariably called forth by open rebellion against authority and the decisions of the Councils, and grave errors in matters of dogma, doctrine and discipline, tending to disturb the order of the Church and to give rise to serious scandals and thus imperil the unity of the faith. Moreover, the heresiarchs were condemned not merely for professing these errors and for refusing to retract them, but because they sought, by every means, to spread their heresies among the poor and ignorant, who were more easily led away, or among princes, sovereigns and other persons in power, whose protection they tried to win by flattering and abetting their worst passions.—Trans.]

CHAPTER IV.

ATTITUDE OF CATHOLICISM AND PROTESTANTISM WITH REGARD TO THE SOCIAL QUESTION.

Poor Relief considered as a *Debitum Legale* and the Teachings of the Church—Contemporary Catholic Socialism and its Natural Origins—Economic Individualism in the Lutheran Doctrines—Economic Tendencies of Luther and Melancthon Contrary to Socialism—Luther and the Peasants who Rebelled against the Abuses of the Large Property System—Social Action of Luther—Social Action of the Church during the Middle Ages—Ecclesiastical Tenures—The Church and the Poor during the Middle Ages—The Forcible Introduction of Protestantism and the Development of Pauperism—Influence of the Social Doctrines of Christianity on the Early Writers of the Present Century—Christian Ideal of Right—Catholic Socialism and Evangelical Socialism—Causes of the Greater Importance of Catholic Socialism—The Catholic Clergy and Socialistic Agitations—The Protestant Clergy and Economic Individualism—A Brief Sketch of Evangelical Socialism—Evangelical Socialism in England—The Extreme Left of Anglican Evangelical Socialism—The Followers of Henry George—The Rev. Stewart D. Headlam—The Guild of St. Matthew—Theories of the Rev. E. Symes—Evangelical Socialism in the United States of America—American Followers of Henry George—Evangelical Socialistic Movement in Switzerland and France—Congress of Lyons—M. Charles Gide—School of Solidarity—Evangelical Socialists in Germany—Their Activity—The Rev. A. Stöcker—Rudolph Todt—Anti-semitism and Socialism—Democratic Sovereignty—The Tradition of Frederick II.—Democratic Anti-Parliamentarism—Harmony existing between Evangelical and Catholic Socialists—Impossibility of any Action in Common—Greater Importance of Catholic Socialism—Difficulty of an Agreement among the Protestant Churches on the Subject of the Social Question.

YET, even when, through social necessity, the Church was obliged to defend the system of individual property against the radical tendencies of the monks of the minor orders, she considered the assistance of the poor as a *debitum legale.* "We must not," observes Roscher, "consider the assistance of the poor practised by the Church as of purely spontaneous origin. Saint Thomas Aquinas calls it *debitum*

legale; the rich were obliged to give to the poor, but this obligation was not of a political character, it was purely religious."[1] Amidst the splendours of the court of Louis XIV., Bossuet, in his emphatic manner, very justly declared that "the Church in her early constitution had been founded for the poor alone, and they are the true citizens of that fortunate city, which the Scriptures call the City of God".[2]

If we consider the teachings of the Gospel, the communistic origins of the Church, the socialistic tendencies of the early fathers, and the traditions of Canon Law, we cannot wonder that at the present day Socialism should count no small number of its adherents among Catholic writers.

The Lutheran Reformation, on the contrary, was in reality a religious reform in favour of the interests of the wealthy classes in Germany. Luther, that bourgeois pontiff, not only held views which were as the antipodes of all the communistic theories of the fathers of the Church, who considered property as an evil become necessary in consequence of the fall of man, but he also professed most restrictive ideas on property.

In the beginning of the sixteenth century the wealthy middle-class was already most powerful in Germany, yet, notwithstanding this, it was, together with the lesser nobility, excluded from political power, which was concentrated in the hands of the Elector Princes, and it submitted but reluctantly to a merely nominal representation in the State Assemblies. In this rivalry between feudal aristocracy on the one hand, and the wealthy bourgeoisie, with the lesser nobles, on the other, the higher nobility used every means to weaken the power of the rich industrialists. Thus, for instance, in 1522, trade was burdened with heavy taxes, and a prohibition was laid on all commercial associations, disposing of capital exceeding fifty thousand florins.

Franz von Sickingen, whose name has been popularised by

[1] Roscher, *Geschichte*, p. 6.

[2] Bossuet, *Sermon sur l'éminent dignité des pauvres, 1er point.* On the economic and social ideas of Bossuet consult the Abbé Lebarq, *Histoire critique de la prédiction de Bossuet.* Paris: Desclée and De Brouwer, 1890.

Ferdinand Lassalle in a celebrated drama, was the hero of the lesser nobility.

As to the wealthy bourgeoisie, by exercising pressure on Charles V., they succeeded in obtaining the revocation of the laws which until then had formed an insurmountable obstacle to the development of capital.

In the meantime, the poverty-stricken rural population rose up against their despoilers; they burnt down the castles of the nobles, and swore that they would leave nothing to be seen upon the land but the cabins of the poor. The rich middle-class seemed at first to side with them, and at Strasburg, Nuremberg, and Ulm the peasants were encouraged, aided, and provided for. However, the bourgeoisie soon grew alarmed at the spreading of the insurrection, and made common cause with the nobles in smothering the revolt in the rural districts. Luther, who was then at the apex of his power, condemned the rising in the name of religion, and proclaimed the servitude of the people as holy and legitimate.[1] "You seek," wrote he, "to free your persons and your goods. You desire the power and the goods of this earth. You will suffer no wrong. The Gospel, on the contrary, has no care for such things, and makes exterior life consist in suffering, supporting injustice, the cross, patience, and contempt of life, as of all the things of this world. To suffer! To suffer! The cross! The cross! Behold what Christ teaches!"[2] Were not these teachings, given in the name of the faith to a famishing people in revolt against the tyranny and avidity of the ruling aristocracy, fatal to the future of the peasant masses, whose very sufferings were thus legitimised in the name of the religion that should have come to their aid?

Luther did not consider the claims of the peasants as in the least unjust; indeed, he admitted that they were "not

[1] See Loria, *Teoria economica della costituzione politica*, p. 74. Ranke, *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation*, vol. i., pp. 206 and 321; vol. ii., pp. 31 and 149; vol. iii., pp. 375 and 377. Leipzig, 6th edition, 1881.

[2] Janet, *Histoire de la science politique*, vol. ii., p. 6. The Catholic author Thonissen, in his *Socialisme depuis l'antiquité*, is mistaken in attributing to Luther socialistic and revolutionary principles.

contrary to natural law or to equity". But, unconscious apostle of bourgeois interests, he immediately added: "No one is judge in his own cause, and the faults committed by authority cannot excuse rebellion. Every man is not called upon to chastise the guilty. And here the authority of the Scriptures lends its support. Let every spirit be subject to the superior powers. He that taketh the sword shall perish by the sword."[1]

Luther, the enemy of all economic assertion of rights on the part of the labouring classes, strove to despoil the clergy for the benefit of the lay middle-class element. Ecclesiastical property was secularised, convents were abolished, the Church was stripped of the immense patrimony she possessed; "finally," writes a Liberal author, "the source from which alms flowed to the indigent was destroyed, and the assistance of the poor ceased entirely to form part of the attributes of the Church".[2]

Melanchthon held ideas no less restrictive, economically speaking, than those of Luther; indeed, he rose to a greater degree of violence than Luther ever did against the communistic theories of the Anabaptists. According to Melanchthon, property exists by divine right, and cannot be modified *jure imperatoris*, as St. Augustine had taught. To deny or limit the right of individual property would be contrary to the morality and teachings of Jesus Christ and of the apostles; for private property, whatever may be its abuses, is not only not contrary to the laws of nature, but not even to the precepts of the Gospel.[3]

[1] Janet, *Histoire de la science politique*, vol. ii., p. 6. See also Roscher, *Geschichte*, etc., p. 68 and following. Ibach ("Der Socialismus in Zeitalter der Reformation," in the *Frankfurter Zeitgemässe Broschüren*, Frankfort, 1880) tries to discern some analogy between modern Socialism and the Lutheran Reformation. On the political and economic ideas of Luther see the lecture by F. I. Stahl, *Der Protestantismus als politisches Princip.*, p. 122. Berlin, 1853.

[2] Mazzola, *L'assicurazione degli operai nella scienza e nella legislazione germanica*, p. 33. Rome: Botta, 1886.

[3] Melanchthon, *Opera*, Bretschneider edition, vol. iii.; *Epistola* i, iii., February, 1531, p. 28. See also Janet, *Histoire de la science politique*, vol. ii., pp. 13 and 14.

Moreover, Luther would have had the Church take no interest whatever in the question of pauperism, and maintained that the obligation of providing for the poor, and of coming to their aid by means of wise economic laws, devolved entirely upon the State. And up to a certain point, though less by intention than as the result of his theories, he was the real precursor of State Socialism. In 1520, owing to the great misery then afflicting Germany, Luther recommended that each city should contribute to the support of its own poor, even with the assistance of the neighbouring cities, and that no foreign beggars or vagabonds should be tolerated.[1] In 1523 he dictated regulations for the *Common Fund of Leissnig*, establishing the following principles: Poor relief is within the competence of the lay community, with which the Church has got no business; no one must be allowed to beg; the poor who are fit for work should be forced to work, the unfit should be aided; workmen who cannot carry on their trade through deficiency of means ought to be assisted with loans; finally, if the capital forming the Fund be exhausted or become insufficient, the members ought to collect the sum wanting among themselves. These regulations were adopted for a long time in Lutheran Germany, but in spite of the severest orders of the authorities and of the efforts made by the various municipalities and by private individuals, their efficacy proved to be relatively very limited.[2]

This difference of tendencies which existed between the Catholic Church and the Lutheran Reformation, with regard to the question of pauperism, has gradually continued increasing. Thus it is at the present day, as we shall see further on, that Catholic socialists would have the Church become the absolute arbiter in the cruel struggle between capital and labour, while, on the contrary, the Evangelical Churches are imbued with Individualism.

Under whatever aspect we may choose to consider it, Socialism is nothing else than the doctrine opposed to Individualism. Now, the origins of Protestantism were too

[1] Mazzola, *L'assicurazione degli operai*, etc., i., c.

[2] Mazzola, work already quoted, pp. 33 and 34; Roscher, *Geschichte*, etc., i., c.

individualistic to allow of its embracing the socialist programme with full faith.

Even when the Catholic Church was in possession of immense domains, she never considered right of property as an absolute right, and always regarded herself as bound to support the poor, and to observe the duties of public relief.

Thus, while in the seventh century the clergy already possessed in France one-third of the territory, in the ninth century half of the whole soil of Italy was in the hands of the Church, and in the eleventh the same was the case in England and in Germany, the condition of the poor in those times was much better than what it became when the Church lost her estates.[1]

While the civil power, after having stripped the Church of her possessions, made the pressure of its iron hand be felt heavily by the starving people, and the barons oppressed their unhappy vassals, the ecclesiastical feudatories, who had neither daughters to marry nor court to keep up, were very clement towards the poor peasantry. And while the unfortunate serfs of the barons were harassed with continual vexations, and dragged on an unendurable life in the service of their lords, the Church feudatories treated their vassals with love and kindness.

Likewise, in the kingdom of Naples, when the Anjou barons, puffed up with pride and power, oppressed their vassals with extortions of every description, the greatest abbey in the south of Italy, the Abbey of Cava, renounced all right to the personal services and labour of its vassals, even assuming the obligation of paying them adequate wages.[2] "The inhabitants of Cava," writes a Liberal historian, "enjoyed, under the protection of the Monastery of the Most Holy Trinity, immunity from taxes, privileges in traffic, the use of an almost free port at Vietri; they cultivated fertile lands free from burdens, without the oppression of *angheria*

[1] See G. Salvioli, *Manuale di storia di diritto italiano*, p. 388. Turin, 1890.

[2] See G. Abignente, *Gli statuti inediti di Cava dei Tirreni*, p. 69. Rome: Loescher, 1886.

or *perangheria*, which had been abolished by Abbot Philip in 1322; without any seigneurial vexations, in a condition almost *ex lege*, not being subject to the king, as were the cities of the demesne, nor to the feudatories, they prospered from day to day, till they reached such a height of prosperity that even the Neapolitans envied their flourishing commerce and great wealth."[1]

The impoverishment of the Church, through the fault of the feudal aristocracy and the capitalist bourgeoisie, was a great misfortune for the people. In the provinces, where this transformation of ecclesiastical property took place slowly, the effects were not so terrible as in England, and in all those States in which the transformation was very rapid.

In the greater number of cases the distribution of ecclesiastical tithes was made in such manner that a third part of them was destined to the poor, the two remaining parts to the expenses of public worship and the support of the clergy.

An English socialist, whose profound historical and economic learning cannot be questioned even by his adversaries, has understood and admirably expressed the many benefits society derived from the Church of the middle ages.[2]

At a time when the sufferings of the lower classes were profound and irremediable, the Catholic Church alone opened her arms to all, and rendered it possible for the sons of humble labourers to rise even to the highest grades of the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

Nor must we forget the action of the monasteries, which almost everywhere contributed to render the lot of the poor less intolerable. Every convent had its own poor, to whom it supplied daily food. At some of the great Italian abbeys the number of the poor relieved frequently amounted to two hundred, as I myself have been able to ascertain in consulting the monastery registers.[3]

[1] See G. Abignente, *Gli statuti inediti di Cava dei Tirreni*, p. 93. Rome: Loescher, 1886.

[2] Hyndman, *The Historical Basis of Socialism in England*. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1884.

[3] See study by author, "Poor Relief in Italy," in the *Economic Review*, January, 1892.

Besides, each monastery harboured a certain number of persons (tertiaries, lay brothers, postulants, etc.) who led a monastic life, thus escaping the hard trials of the struggle for existence. They were, generally speaking, men who would have perished had they been obliged to face the battle of life; timid natures formed for silence and peace. It was a true selection, not of the strongest, but of the weak, to whom daily sustenance and a tranquil life was thus assured, while at the same time they were forbidden to continue their species.

"The relations of the Church, the monasteries, and the clergy to the people were also most important from every point of view. There is nothing more noteworthy in the history of the human mind than the manner in which this essential portion of English society in the middle ages has been handled by our ordinary economists, chroniclers, and religionists. Even sober, and, in the main, tolerably conscientious writers, seem to lose their heads or become afraid to tell the truth on this matter. Just as the modern capitalist can see nothing but anarchy and oppression in the connection between the people and the feudal noble, so the authors who represent the middle-class economy of our time, the Protestant divines whose creed is, the devil take the hindmost here and hereafter, fail to discover anything but luxury, debauchery, and hypocrisy in the Catholic Church of the fifteenth century. It is high time that, without any prejudice in favour of that Church, the nonsense which has been foisted on to the public by men interested in suppressing the facts, should be exposed It is not true that the Church of our ancestors was the organised fraud which it suits fanatics to represent it. . . . It is not true that the great revenues of the celibate clergy and the celibate recluses were squandered, as a rule, in riotous living. As a mere question of religion, Catholicism was as good as any creed which has ever found acceptance amongst men. Abuses, doubtless, there were, and most of them were bitterly attacked by members of the Church themselves; tyranny and persecution there were, too, in many forms; but the Church, as all know, was the one body in which equality of conditions was the rule from the start. There. at least, the

man of ability, who, outside her pale, was forced to bow down before some Norman baron, whose ruffianly ancestor had formed part of William's gang of marauders, could rise to a position in which this rough, unlettered, swashbuckler grovelled before him. Sixtus V. was picked up out of the gutter; our Englishman, Nicholas Breakspear, Adrian IV., was a poor labourer's son; and these are but two instances out of thousands of distinguished ecclesiastics of humble birth."[1]

And, according to Hyndman, the Church not only spent half of her revenue on the poor, but she did still more. "The books of the conventual establishments also show that a large portion of the income derived from their lands was spent by the monks in entertaining strangers, in relieving beggars, in attending the sick, and in other good works. Granting that large sums were wasted on the useless ceremonies of masses and candles, that some of the monasteries had a well-managed refectory, and an admirable cellar of wine and beer, it is certain, nevertheless, that the abbots and priors were the best landlords in England, and that so long as the Church held its lands and its power, permanent pauperism was unknown. The general employment which, as landlords resident among the people, they afforded, the improvements of the farms and of their own buildings which they carried out, the excellent work in road-making which they did—a task specially necessary in those times—in addition to their action as public alms-givers, teachers, doctors, and nurses, show what useful people many of these much-abused monks and nuns really were. The monkish ignorance and superstition of which we hear so much, the 'drones' who slept away their lives in comfort and ease at the cost of other men's labour, were no more ignorant and superstitious than a Church of England parson, or a Wesleyan preacher, and were less dependent on the labour of their fellows than Baptist orators or Radical capitalists of to-day. . . ."[2]

Besides, the beneficial influence of the Catholic Church during the middle ages, the great social utility of the

[1] H. M. Hyndman, *The Historical Basis*, etc., pp. 14 and 15.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 16-19.

religious orders in those rude times, when might was arbiter in all things, and the socialistic organisation often to be noted in the ecclesiastical tenures of that period, have been recognised not only by the socialist Hyndman, but even by adversaries of the Church, and by several of the most convinced writers belonging to the Liberal school, as Thorold Rogers, Adam Smith, Eden,[1] etc.

And, according to Hyndman, what was the effect of the violent introduction of Protestantism under Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, the unconscious representatives of the new aristocracy of finance? "The poor, who had ever obtained ready relief from the Church; the wayfarers, who could always find food and shelter in the religious houses; the children of the people, who repaired to the convent for guidance and teaching, were deprived at one fell swoop of alms, shelter, and school. This great and powerful estate, which naturally sided with the people against the monarch and the aristocracy, now became a means of oppression in the hands of the aristocracy and the middle-class. Rack-renting and usury were henceforth sanctioned instead of being denounced, *and the Protestant Reformation became a direct cause of the increasing misery of the mass of Englishmen.*"[2]

Naturally, when prolonged peace and a good political and economic organisation had contributed to increase the population, the monasteries, which for centuries had been the sole resource of the poor and the weak, began to grow burdensome. Many lands belonging to churches and convents lay fallow, many others were badly cultivated. In the meantime the middle-class, under the protecting shadow of peace, had been slowly developing in the cities and towns, amassing wealth by prosperous commercial enterprise; the broad lands of the monasteries naturally attracted their bourgeois

[1] See article in the *Œsterreichische Monatsschrift für Christliche Social-Reform*, "Der sociale Werth der Katholischen Kirche," pp. 177-190. April, 1884. Touching the social action of the Church in the middle ages, see also the noteworthy pamphlet by the Very Rev. Edward G. Bagshawe, *Mercy and Justice for the Poor*, pp. 10-12. London: Kegan Paul, 1885.

[2] Hyndman, *The Historical Basis*, etc., p. 32.

savings. Then it was that the conventual houses, which in some parts were very numerous, began to be considered as detrimental, and that a system of legislation destined to gradually suppress them was first initiated.

The democratic socialists, whose conception of life is frequently rather brutal, not only persist wrongly in considering Christianity, and especially Catholicism, as contrary to the fundamental doctrines of Socialism, but deny most unjustly the wide-spread and beneficial action of the Catholic Church in past times.

Nevertheless, if we but examine dispassionately the works of the early writers on Socialism, we must at once perceive the great influence exercised on them by the social ideas of Christianity, which have served almost everywhere as a basis to the claims of the present day. Even writers who, like Saint-Simon, Cabet, and many others, were decidedly adverse to Christianity, felt its influence far more than is generally believed.

Saint-Simon, ardent and mystical, evidently sought with his last work, *Le Nouveau Christianisme*, to bring about a reform of Christianity.[1] According to Christian doctrines pure and simple, the needy classes ought to resign themselves with abnegation to their privations, but Saint-Simon, on the contrary, taught them to aspire to enjoyment and the satisfaction of their desires. He thus thought to give a larger and more exact interpretation of Christianity.[2]

"Your predecessors," said Saint-Simon, addressing the Pope, "have sufficiently perfected and propagated the theology of Christianity. It is now your duty to attend to the application of its doctrines. True Christianity should render men happy not only in heaven, but also on earth. Let your task consist in organising the human species according to the

[1] Saint-Simon, *Nouveau Christianisme*, p. 91, ed. Bossange. Paris, 1825. The frontispiece of the book bears the following epigraph: "He that loveth his fellow-man fulfilleth the law. . . . All is briefly contained in this word: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

[2] See L. Reybaud, *Études sur les réformateurs ou socialistes modernes*, vol. i., pp. 55-62; 4me edition.

fundamental principle of divine morality. You must not limit your action to reminding the faithful that the poor are the beloved children of God, but must boldly and energetically employ all the power and the means of the militant Church to bring about a speedy improvement in the moral and physical condition of the most numerous class."[1]

Robert Owen, instead, carried away by his ideal of rational religion, met with insuperable obstacles in the dissensions of the clergy. He considered all existing religions as false, immoral, subversive, and contrary to the laws of nature; according to him, the clearest proof of the vanity of these religions was to be found in the misery of all society founded on their model. In his colony of New Lanark, Catholics, Quakers, Anabaptists, Anglicans, Presbyterians and Methodists all lived together without the faintest idea of proselytising; in the New Lanark schools no religious instruction whatever was imparted to the children. He was guided by the same principle in the foundation of his American colony of New Harmony.[2] Nevertheless, it is easy to perceive throughout Owen's work how much more the English philanthropist was influenced by the doctrines of Christianity than by rationalistic or utilitarian theories.

Nor was Cabet able to avoid the same influence. His *Voyage en Icarie* was taken, more or less directly, from the Utopists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the social doctrines of Christianity, and the writings of the early fathers of the Church. Indeed, in his preface to the wonderful travels of Lord Carisdal in the mysterious land of Icaria, Cabet, whose communistic fanaticism led him so far as to consider Cousin, Guizot, Villemain, De Tocqueville, Lamennais, etc., as Communists, maintains that Christianity and Communism are, after all, but synonymous terms.[3]

[1] See *Œuvres* by Saint-Simon, published by Rodrigue, *Le vrai nouveau christianisme*, pp. 138-149. Paris, 1832.

[2] Reybaud, work quoted, vol. i., pp. 226, 227, 236, 239, and 245.

[3] Cabet strove to prove this argument more amply in an unimportant compilation on the Gospel, *Le vrai christianisme;* see also the study on Cabet by A. Holynski, "Cabet et les Icariens," in the *Revue Socialiste*, November, 1871.

And in Germany, even Marlo, who is so rigorously exact in his economic deductions, believed that the real cause of the social difficulty lies in our present industrial organisation, which does not in the least correspond to the Christian theory of right we have gradually been forming for ourselves. The Christian theory of right is founded on the dignity of the human race, and proclaims that all men, from the mere fact of their being men, have an equal right to the enjoyment of the highest possible degree of happiness. Up to the French Revolution it was the Pagan ideal of right, hereditary privilege and "monopolism," that prevailed; now, instead, according to Marlo, the Christian ideal, or "panpolism," should prevail.[1]

This tendency to consider the modern economic *régime* as thoroughly opposed to the social principles of Christianity, was, as we shall presently see, the true origin of Evangelical Socialism and of Catholic Socialism, both born of the same need and under almost identical circumstances. However, it is undeniable that the same tendency is likewise to be found in positivist writers.

Germany, which has always been the true land of Socialism, beheld the birth and development of the Catholic, as well as of the Evangelical school. But, notwithstanding that the Catholic population of Germany is far less numerous than the Evangelical,[2] Catholic Socialism has been, and still is, of much more importance, and much more widely diffused than Evangelical Socialism. The reasons of this are very obvious.

The Lutheran Reformation, as I have already stated, was the triumph of middle-class Individualism,[3] and Luther himself held the most restrictive economic and social theories.

The Lutheran Church has ever since continued in the direction given to it by its founder. Catholicism, instead, is

[1] Marlo, *Untersuchungen über die Organisation der Arbeit oder System der Weltöconomie*, preface.

[2] Germany counted, 31st December, 1881, 25,581,685 members of Evangelical Churches; 14,869,292 Catholics; 512,153 Jews; 82,158 of other persuasions; 13,504 various, or of no religion. See Reclus, *Nuova Geografia Universale*, vol. i., pp. 1060-1061, translated by Brunialti.

[3] Loria, *Teoria economica della constituzione politica.*

communist by its origin and traditions, and having from the earliest times entrusted the assistance of the poor to the Church as a *debitum legale*, was naturally predisposed to take an interest in the labour question, and has done so with large and impartial judgment.[1]

Besides, the organisation of the Catholic Church affords her clergy better opportunities of knowing the wants and tendencies of the people and of interesting themselves in the labour question, than Protestant ecclesiastics can ever command. Almost all Catholic priests live upon charity and the voluntary contributions of the faithful. They are obliged, as a necessity of their position, to pass the greater part of their lives among poor people, whose wants, tendencies, and aspirations they become thoroughly acquainted with. Moreover, the Catholic Church, with her powerful organisation, dating back over many centuries, has accustomed Catholic peoples to passive obedience, to a passive renunciation of the greater part of individualistic tendencies. And, naturally enough, though very frequently compelled in her own interest to act in a contrary sense, the Church cannot but feel how important it is for her influence that her economic organisation should be fully as rigid and unchangeable as her ecclesiastical constitution.

The clergy of the Reformed Church, on the other hand, are almost always doctors of divinity, for the most part handsomely remunerated by Government. They are, in the fullest sense of the word, the bureaucrats of religion; and as they are, generally speaking, rather wanting in the spirit of initiative, they are as minor satellites revolving round the orbit of the State, ready, by reason of their position, to accept the conservative theories of the statesmen upon whom they depend, and from whom they receive their means of subsistence.

The Catholic socialist movement has, moreover, been of far greater importance than that of the Evangelical socialists. Initiated at an earlier period, and under the patronage of

[1] See the article by Count de Ségur-Lamoignon, "Le Catholicisme et le Protestantisme dans la Question Sociale," in the *Association Catholique : Revue Mensuelle des Questions Sociales et Ouvrières*, vol. xx., p. 141.

the higher functionaries of the Church, it has naturally met with the sanction of the Roman *Curia*, and is, to a certain extent, a token of the attitude which the Church intends to assume in regard to the social question.

The various Protestant Churches are wanting in organic unity; they have no direct head. Each Protestant clergyman acts upon his own impulse, without any direct control from his superiors. The absence of an ecclesiastical hierarchy, though it may facilitate the boldest personal initiatives, renders almost completely impossible all collective action in which there is call for unity of direction from above, and submissive obedience in the subordinates.

On the other hand, history has never yet recorded the existence of a religious association better organised than is the Catholic Church. Consequently, a socialistic current in the bosom of the Church, or among the Catholic clergy of any particular region, is of far greater importance than might at first appear, for were such a current contrary to the wants or aspirations of the Church, she could easily repress it.

On the contrary, when the clergy of the Reformed Church interest themselves in the social question, they but contribute their own individual action, and even supposing that action in common were possible among them, there could be no unity of direction. Then, a certain number of their members might, if they so wished, keep aloof from the movement, or even oppose it. The whole mass of the Catholic clergy, on the other hand, is ready upon all occasions to follow in obedience the voice of their Pontiff.

The Catholic clergy, living upon the voluntary contributions of the faithful, have a direct interest in preserving the attachment of the labouring classes, as, especially since the Revolution, the middle classes tend to estrange themselves from the Church.

The Protestant clergy depend upon the State for their living, and, precisely on account of their official position, they must feel more sympathy towards the dominating classes, whose interests, very naturally, can hardly ever coincide with those of the more numerous class, the people. Conse-

quently, they are placed in an uncertain and embarrassing position. On the one side they have the teachings of the Gospel, and feel how necessary it is for them not to alienate the love of the masses, and to study the questions relating to the wider interests with calm impartiality; on the other, their Lutheran traditions, their semi-official position, and the necessity of not opposing the interests of the governing classes. And just because of their position they remain wanting in all unity of action and daring initiative.

As is very evident in Germany, where the struggle is greater and more active, the Catholic clergy have been able to effect much by adopting a large part of the socialistic theories, whereas the Protestants who have devoted themselves to the social question have done nothing beyond creating interminable disputes, holding congresses of more or less utility, and rousing anti-semitic agitations. They are principally wanting in that which constitutes the great prerogative of the Catholic clergy, *i.e.* strength of association and unity of direction.

It is only in England that the socialistic tendencies of a large number of the clergy of the Reformed Church can be traced back to a relatively distant epoch.[1] In 1848, Kingsley, Frederick Denison Maurice, Tom Hughes, Mr. Ludlow, and some others, without apparently having been influenced by the theories of Lamennais, started a paper, *The Christian Socialist*, and were most active in promoting the rapid development of co-operative societies. Though they had no definite socialistic scheme, they yet attacked none the less violently the large property system, and the pernicious effects of the Manchester school. "I do not see," said Maurice, "my way further than this; competition is put forth as the law of the

[1] On Evangelical Socialism in England, consult Lujo Brentano, *Die Christlich-Sociale Bewegung in England*, p. 124, Leipzig, Dunker & Humbolt, 1883; and the preface (by Goddard H. Orpen) to the English translation of *The Socialism of To-day*, by Laveleye, reproduced in the last French edition of the same work, pp. 346 and 356; see also T. Hughes, "Frederick Denison Maurice as a Christian Socialist," in the *Economic Review*, April, 1891, and the excellent book by M. Kaufman, *Christian Socialism*, London, 1888.

universe. That is a lie." And, according to Kingsley, the system of liberal economy taught by the Manchester school was a "narrow, conceited, hypocritical, anarchic, and atheistic scheme of the universe".[1] The Christian socialist movement was at first independent of the co-operative movement; indeed, the Rochdale Pioneers, who, in 1844, gave the first impulse to the distributive societies, were Owenites. However, in 1850, Maurice reunited in the Society for Promoting Working Men's Associations, the Christian Socialists and the supporters of co-operative societies.[2]

Although many of the "Christian Socialist" associations were but short-lived, the action of the publication bearing that title was anything but ineffectual, and had a certain influence even on the legislative decisions of the time.

At the present day Christian socialists in England are divided into various schools; the first, but least important, still follows the teachings of Maurice and Kingsley; the second school is much more advanced, and follows the lead given by the German pastor, Herr Stöcker, and the Roman Catholic Archbishop, the late Monsignor Von Ketteler; lastly, the third, founded fifteen years ago, is the most daring and most radical of all; it accepts almost entirely the theories of Marx and of Henry George. The extreme "left" of the Christian socialist party in England is represented by the Guild of St. Matthew. The Rev. Stewart B. Headlam, warden of the guild, in writing to Mr. Orpen some years ago, said: "Our position towards Maurice and Kingsley is that of enthusiastic disciples. We know that some of their experiments were failures, but we think we are carrying out their principles more faithfully than those who go in merely for co-operation. . . . Roughly speaking, I should say that a Christian socialist believes that the Church—the whole body of the baptised—is intended to be an organised society for the promotion of righteousness,

[1] See Goddard H. Orpen, translation of Laveleye's *Socialism of To-day*, pp. 300, 301, 302. See, likewise, on Christian Socialism in England up to 1853, L. Brentano, *Die Christlich-Sociale*, etc., pp. 75 and 78.

[2] See R. T. Ely, *French and German Socialism in Modern Times*, p 252, London, 1883.

and that when the officers and members recognise *that*, the distribution of wealth will be absolutely different from what it is at present. Meanwhile, believing in the State as also a sacred institution, we use all our efforts to get such laws made as will tend to bring about a better distribution, *e.g.*, to get rid of private property in land, eventually; at once to re-impose the four shilling tax on present value, and claim all unearned increment; progressive income-tax; free schools with free dinners, etc. We show to all Christians who would 'suffer' by these measures that they are really measures to help them to live the life of brotherhood, which, in the present complicated state of 'civilisation,' is very difficult for them to do, even if they wish to do so; for we believe that all little societies, be they Co-operative or Communistic, are really only helping themselves at the cost of those outside, while the present anarchy lasts. . . . I always find that the first thing wanted is to convince an ordinary Christian that Jesus Christ was a secular worker, and that the Kingdom of Heaven of which He spoke meant the Church on earth. If you can once get rid of the 'other worldliness,' which forms the religion of so many people, half—more than half—the battle is won."[1]

The more advanced English Christian socialists are but a few degrees removed from social democracy. And although the *Church Reformer*, the organ of the Guild of St. Matthew, declares that Socialism is more the outcome of the teachings of Christ and of St. Paul than of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, yet the influence of the two last named on the extreme "left" of the Anglican clergy is very notable. The Rev. J. E. Symes, Professor at University College, Nottingham, has reduced the programme of his party to the very simple formula: "Taking from the rich and giving to the poor". In a paper read before an audience almost entirely composed of clergymen, Professor Symes frankly maintained that every man "has a natural right to the produce of his own labours, but that when he needs the co-operation of others, they have an equal right to offer their own terms". This fact justifies the

[1] Goddard H. Orpen, work quoted, p. 303.

taxing of the rich for the benefit of the poor. From the economic point of view it is necessary to distinguish taxes according as they affect rent, interest, and earnings respectively. As taxes on rent are mere transfers of wealth, they are unobjectionable; they do not in the least render the land less productive, nor do they cause a rise in rent, unless where the land has been previously under-rented. A tax falling on interest that would tend to drive capital abroad would be inexpedient, for capital is indispensable to labour. While, instead, a tax on the earnings of commercial and professional people would meet with fewer difficulties; it is far easier to transfer abroad capital than ability.

Besides the Nonconformist Churches, in which men of high standing and moral worth, such as Dr. Clifford, the Rev. H. Stead, Dr. Labrum, Dr. Mearns and many other men of intellect and learning, have embraced the tenets of Socialism, the Church of England, notwithstanding its conservative traditions, now counts among its clergy many advanced socialists, as Bishop Westcott, the Rev. Dr. Girdlestone and a number of others who do not hesitate before the boldest and most radical reforms.[1]

For some years past a large number of Anglican clergymen have set in with the evangelical socialist current. However, the theories of Herr Stöcker and Archbishop Ketteler have met with many more adherents than those of Marx and Henry George. Nevertheless, the followers of the "Messiah of Treves" and of the American economist are very numerous, and the Guild of St. Matthew alone, the most radical of all, counts forty-five ecclesiastics, among whose names are to be found those of men noted for their learning and high moral worth.

Within these last years Christian Socialism has likewise been making rapid progress in the United States of America, where it has been embraced by a large number of the Protestant clergy, among whom Henry George enjoys the fullest

[1] See the article by Raoul Allier, "Le Protestantisme et les Questions Sociales," in the *Revue Encyclopédique*, 1st February, 1892.

sympathy.[1] The *Ban* of Boston, the organ of the important and very numerous Christian Socialist Society, daily expresses ideas not greatly opposed to those of the collectivists. Dr. Frederick Van Huntington, Bishop of New York, founded about eight years ago the Church Association for the Advancement of the Interests of Labour, which has met with the warmest sympathy, and is spreading rapidly.[2]

In Switzerland the Evangelical socialists are much less active, less cultured, and less daring than the Catholic socialists, who are led with such ardour by Gaspard Decurtins. The *Société Chrètienne Suisse d'Économie Sociale*, founded five years ago, and now presided over by F. Necker, setting aside "all political, ecclesiastical or dogmatical pre-occupations," has for sole aim the examination of all that which "in the present social conditions is in contradiction to the laws of justice, charity and solidarity, which according to the orders of God Himself ought to regulate the relations of men to each other, and to provoke a reform by means that are in harmony with these same laws".[3]

The pastors of the French Protestant Church, on the contrary, are wanting neither in daring nor in activity. Many of them have accepted not a few of the theories of Socialism, and the views expressed by several speakers at the Congress

[1] On the history of Christian Socialism in America, see the article by Laurence Gronlund, "Christian Socialism in America," in the *Christian Register*, 13th June, 1889, p. 380.

[2] It professes the following principles:—1. It is of the essence of the teachings of Jesus Christ, that God is the Father of all men, and that all men are brothers. 2. God is the sole possessor of the earth and its fulness: man is but the steward of God's bounties. 3. Labour being the exercise of body, mind and spirit in the broadening and elevating of human life, it is the duty of every man to labour diligently. 4. Labour, as thus defined, should be the standard of social worth. 5. When the divinely-intended opportunity to labour is given to all men, one great cause of the present widespread suffering and destitution will be removed.

[3] See article 1° of the statute in the *Bulletin No. 1° de la Société Chrètienne Suisse d'Économie Sociale*, p. 3; Geneva: Richter, 1889. See also, on the Christian socialist movement in the east of Switzerland, the letter of C. W. Kambli in the *Travaux de l'Association Protestante*, etc., pp. 214-217; Paris: Fischbacher.

held at Lyons, November, 1889, show that the progress made in these last years is very great indeed. Some of the most eminent divines admit that the ideal of socialists is by far superior to that of their opponents,[1] and that our present industrial system, based on competition and privilege, is both unjust and un-Christian. They consider that no clergyman who declares the socialistic theories to be Utopian, and refuses to see the good points they contain, can be a thorough Christian; and, finally, they profess ideas that tend not a little towards Socialism. Charles Gide, the most noteworthy representative of the Protestant socialist school in France, in a conference held at Geneva about five years ago, exposed very clearly the programme of his party. Between the school of liberty, that of authority, to which the Catholic socialists belong, and the school of equality, that of socialists, he places the school of solidarity. According to this distinguished writer, liberty and equality are but ideals; solidarity is a fact, one of the facts that have been most clearly established by science and by history. At the present day the relations existing between men have increased; men now depend upon one another much more than formerly. Society is an organism. A day will come when no one shall be able to become rich if all are not enriched, and no one become poor without all the others likewise being impoverished. We must consider the present condition of things not as necessary and permanent, but as the mere result of a long series of historical causes, and destined to be progressively modified towards an ever-increasing solidarity. But in order to modify this present state of things in the sense that history points out to us, we must not be content with the barren and unproductive system of *laissez-faire*, nor limit our efforts solely to an appeal to individual energy; if we wish to modify our present social surroundings, we must boldly have recourse to State intervention.[2]

[1] *Travaux de l'Association Protestante*, etc., p. 60.

[2] See the address "L'École Nouvelle," published in the *Revue du Christianisme Pratique*, 15th May, 1890, pp. 334-336. In his study, *Du rôle pratique du pasteur dans les questions sociales*, Paris, Fischbacher,

French Protestant socialists, like a great many Protestant socialists in England and America, consider, however, that the development of co-operation presents the most efficacious method of solving the social problem.[1]

But, whatever may be their views, Protestants in France are too few in number to be able to exercise any decisive influence on the political economy of the Government or the social movement of the country.

A country in which, owing to many special circumstances, Evangelical Socialism has been for a number of years, and still continues to be, a well-organised party, guided by able and intelligent persons, favoured to a certain extent by statesmen, and encouraged by many learned economists, is Prussia, the now "classic land" of Socialism, where all the more important forms of the contemporary socialistic movement have budded and acquired scientific consistency.

Though of rather recent formation, the Christian Monarchical Socialist party disposes of many forces, and is even now of no small account.

In the face of the widespread movement promoted by Monsignor Ketteler and the Catholic bishops, the Protestant clergy felt how urgent it was for them not to remain indifferent to the social question. "The Church of Rome," said their leading paper, "will appear as the defender of the people's rights. The Evangelical Church is not represented in Parliament, and is looked upon as the ally of despotism. Ought not Protestant Christians to strive to efface this impression by dedicating themselves to the interests of the people? If Protestant believers show apathy towards the social ques-

1889, Gide, having recognised the essential affinity existing between Christianity and Socialism, proves that all pastors are bound to meet the social question face to face with positive arguments and elevated views.

[1] L'Association Protestante pour l'Étude Pratique des Questions Sociales has held a number of Congresses: at Nimes (1888), Lyons (1889), Montbéliard (1890), and Marseilles (1891), and others. At the Marseilles Congress Charles Gide spoke with much vigour and efficacy in favour of the legal reduction of the working day, and the late M. Waddington defended with great warmth the new labour legislation. See the *Travaux du congrès de Marseille*, p. 210, Paris: Fischbacher, 1892.

tion, which is truly the most important existing, for our own times as for the future, if they do not enter into it sincerely and with ardour, they will lose all influence over the lower classes, who will either turn to Catholicism or to liberal unbelief."[1]

Seconded by distinguished economists, such as Professor A. Wagner, Dr. Stöcker, Professor von Scheel,[2] the Social Evangelical party spread rapidly under the impulse given it by two very active men: Herren R. Todt and A. Stöcker. They felt that the people were turning away from a religion that offered them only abstract formulas. If the Reformed Church were but to descend into the arena of economic conflict, and study the social wants of the poorer classes, supporting the true interests of the people, it would instead easily win the affection of the masses.[3]

Why should the people follow the atheist and revolutionary demagogue, who brings them a despairing doctrine, rather than the priest who offers them the Gospel, the book of the poor and the oppressed?

Adolph Stöcker, who had formerly been Court preacher, has sought with much ardour during the last twenty years to combat the atheistic and materialistic tendencies of social democracy, and to re-conduct to Christianity the masses who had turned away or who are gradually forsaking it. By addressing the people at public meetings, and boldly attacking his adversaries, he has succeeded in winning sympathy to such an extent as to have been applauded even by the hostile crowd. Neither the irony of the liberals nor the violence of the anarchists has ever been able to damp his courage.[4] Herr

[1] See *Die neue evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, October, 1878.

[2] See Von Scheel, *Unsere sociale politische Parteien*, Berlin, 1878.

[3] See R. Todt, *Der innere Zusammenhang und die nothwendige Verbindung zwischen dem Studium der Theologie und dem Studium der Socialwissenschaften.*

[4] Laveleye, *Le Socialisme Contemporain*, pp. 123 and 126; John Rae, *Contemporary Socialism.* Among the numerous addresses delivered by Herr Stöcker, all full of evangelical zeal and passionate eloquence, note in particular, *Socialdemokratisch, Socialistich und Christlich-Social*, p. 24, Brunswick, Wollermann, 1880; *Die Bedeutung der christlichen Weltan-*

Stöcker's violent anti-semitism is, after all, only Socialism pure and simple. Further on we shall see that Austrian and German anti-semitists are for the most part but unconscious socialists. In Austria as in Germany the Jews form a class apart that monopolises and absorbs everything, has all sorts of financial resources at its command, and participates in all kinds of speculations. In England, France and Italy the Jews have more or less amalgamated with the rest of the population, consequently we cannot judge of the importance of Herr Stöcker's anti-semitic crusade except by placing ourselves at his standpoint. In Germany, instead, the Jews dispose of a vast amount of capital, and form the strongest and most powerful financial bourgeoisie in Europe. Consequently, religion serves as a justification of the conflict and allows popular anti-semitism to appear under a less radical and socialistic aspect.[1]

Rudolph Todt, whose book on radical German Socialism and Christian society has met with such enormous success, is, after Stöcker, the most eminent representative of Evangelical Socialism in Germany. Although his views present nothing very original, he is in every sense a most remarkable writer. According to him, political economy is as anatomy which makes known the construction of the body social; Socialism is the pathology that describes the maladies; the Church represents therapeutics, and prescribes the proper remedies. "Whoever would understand the social question and wishes to aid in solving it," runs the epigraph inscribed on the title-page of his book, "must have on his right hand the works on political economy, on his left those on scientific Socialism, and before him must keep open the New Testament."[2]

schauung für die brennenden Fragen der Gegenwart, p. 21, Gera, Burow, 1881; *Die Bibel und die sociale Frage*, p. 16, Nuremberg, Braun, 1881; *Grosse Zeiten, Grosse Aufgaben*, p. 16, etc., Leipzig, Lehmann, 1881.

[1] See Paul Vasili, *La Société de Berlin*, 23rd edition, Paris; *Nouvelle Revue*, 1886, the chapter "M. Stöcker et la Question Juive".

[2] Rudolph Todt, *Der radikale deutsche Socialismus und die christliche Gesellschaft*, Wittenberg, Herrosé, 1878, *Einleitung*. On the importance of German Evangelical Socialism see R. Allier, article already noted; also the conference by Dr. Stöcker, Geneva, in the volume, *Le Christianisme et la Question Sociale*, Paris, Fischbacher, 1892.

The nature of the present study does not allow of my dwelling at length on the doctrines and tendencies of the associations and congresses of the German Evangelical socialists.[1] Politically speaking, they are as a rule conservatives, and affect great scorn for the Parliamentary system. According to them, Parliamentary parties are simply coalitions of various interests, groups that represent the egotism of the middle-classes, and exploit the action of the State in their own behalf. The king alone, as representative of the permanent interests of the nation, may boldly take up the defence of the poor and oppressed, for he alone derives no advantage from the subjection of the masses. Now, in the struggle with the wealthy bourgeoisie, who have the preponderancy in modern Parliaments, and oppress the poor, the sovereign ought to be the champion of the labouring classes.

Besides, these anti-parliamentary tendencies are very common in Germany, where the monarchy follows the traditions of Frederick II., and even at the present day considers itself the natural protector of the people's interests.

Is the social question to be that neutral ground on which Catholics and Evangelical Protestants will possibly come to an agreement? Many Catholic priests took part in the Evangelical congresses recently held in Germany. Protestants are admitted as members into almost all the Catholic associations, and, as will be seen further on, not a few Catholics form part of Protestant societies. But a true understanding, a real

[1] Whoever wishes to form an exact idea of this movement should read Roscher, *Die Betheiligung der evangelischen Geistlichen an der socialen Bewegung unserer Zeit*, p. 73, Berlin, Puttkammer, 1878; Adolph Wach, *Die Christliche-Sociale Arbeiterpartei*, p. 47, Leipzig, Tauchnitz, 1878; the social Evangelical paper, *Die deutsche Volkswacht;* Laveleye, *Le Socialisme Contemporain*, chap. vii.; J. Rae, *Contemporary Socialism* (2nd ed.), chap. vii. The Liberal press derides the Social Evangelical party with the most cutting irony, declaring that it prefers the violence of the Social Democrats to the hypocritical Socialism (*Mucker-Socialismus*) of the Protestant clergy; see Rae, work already quoted. Cremer calls Herr Stöcker "the Boulanger of Christian Socialism". See Claude Jannet, *Le Socialisme d'État*, etc., p. 170, note 2, and F. Kaufmann, *Christian Socialism*, chap. vii., London, 1888.

accord, is not only difficult, but impossible. If much sympathy of feeling exists between Catholic and Evangelical socialists, the aims towards which the two Churches tend, like the principles from which they start, render any real and lasting harmony most unlikely.[1]

Certainly, among Protestant socialists, especially in England and America, there are men of much worth and daring, who accept the theories of Marx and George with enthusiasm, and are convinced collectivists. But Socialism, which in every respect tends to narrow the sphere of individual liberty, finds more favour among the Catholic than among the Protestant clergy. The Lutheran Reformation was of a distinctly individualist character, and the early traditions of the Reformed Church are at once individualist and conservative.[2] Catholics, on the other hand, have for ages been accustomed to restrictions on their individual liberty, and more easily become resigned to conservative Socialism.

Although the extreme "left" of Evangelical Socialism counts men like Stewart D. Headlam among its members, the Protestant Churches are wanting in organic unity, and, consequently, even their boldest attempts remain but as isolated facts of very limited importance. As their clergy have no real ecclesiastical hierarchy, they generally act upon their own impulse and on their own account. The Protestant Churches are many in number, and but little united among one another. They vary according to each country, and are frequently, as in the United States, of many denominations in the same State.

Now, for all large initiative a broad basis of action is necessary. The social question and Socialism are interna-

[1] Frederick Necker said, in writing to me: "I believe that it will not be easy to come to an understanding, except as to the means to be employed to attain power, were that possible". And Charles Gide writes: "This reciprocal sympathy will never reach a mutual understanding".

[2] See the "Chronique," by Charles Gide, in the *Revue d'Économie Politique*, May-June, 1890, pp. 316 and 317.

tional questions, which do not interest one state alone, but all civilised nations.

Ever since the third century the Catholic Church has had a decidedly universal character, and is, in consequence, much better prepared to face the social question than are the Protestant Churches. Besides, she forms a compact organism, possessing a severe and disciplined ecclesiastical hierarchy. In questions of such weighty importance as the social question and Socialism, no priest acts on his own account without the direct control of the Church. Naturally, every attempt made by the Catholic clergy, which meets with the approval of the Vatican, at once assumes great importance, for it points out a new tendency in the Church. It consequently becomes evident beyond all doubt, that the Sovereign Pontiff would never have permitted socialistic schools to form and spread within the bosom of the Church, had he believed them to be contrary to the Gospel and the traditions of the faith.

CHAPTER V.

MONSIGNOR VON KETTELER AND CATHOLIC SOCIALISM IN GERMANY.

Socialism in Germany—German Socialism and French Socialism—Distrust in Liberty—Progress of Socialism in Germany—Traditions of Conservative Socialism—The *Preussisches allgemeine Landrecht*—German Social Policy—Historic Traditions of Germany and State Socialism—The Catholic Church in Germany and the Social Question—Döllinger's Invitation—Kolping's *Gesellenvereine*—Monsignor Von Ketteler—His Doctrines—"The Labour Question is a Stomach Question"—Archbishop Von Ketteler and the Modern Industrial System—Criticism of *Self-help*—The Liberal School and Socialism—Consequences of Liberalism—Lassalle's Productive Associations compared with those founded by Monsignor Ketteler—State Intervention and Church Intervention—Monsignor Von Ketteler's Deceptions.

SOCIALISM, as a political party, was very late in penetrating into Germany. Even the Revolution of 1848 had but a national and unionist character. The solid economic constitution of the country, the time-honoured privileges of the nobility, the state of subjection of the peasantry, and the almost total exclusion of the working classes from any participation in politics, added to many other "historic causes," formed, up to 1860, a constant and serious obstacle to the rapid spread of Socialism. Indeed, the writers and economists who were the real pioneers of modern Socialism, such as Fichte, Rodbertus Jagetzow, Marlo, etc., only began to be known and studied after Lassalle and Marx had entered upon their daring propaganda.

Before Socialism had yet found its way into Germany, it was already beginning to decline in France. A noted French writer, Louis Reybaud, exclaimed in a transport of blind optimism, "Socialism is dead!"[1] But what a poor thing

[1] See the article, "Socialisme et les Socialistes," in the *Dictionnaire de l'Économie Politique*, Paris, 1853.

French Socialism then was, rambling aimlessly from Saint-Simon's new religion to Fourier's phalansteries, Cabet's Icarian Utopias, Leroux's romantic fancies, and the strange and violent theories of Proudon, whose "Philosophy of Misery" has been so justly defined by Marx as the "Misery of Philosophy".

The causes from which Socialism arose in Germany were very different from those which developed it in France.

French Socialism sprang from excessive faith in the benefits of liberty. The leaders of the Revolution had long considered liberty as all-sufficient, and as being in itself so great a boon as to render all social evils less painful and intolerable. When, however, through excess of political liberty the action of Government became wavering and uncertain, and the antagonism existing between the different classes of society, and the subjection of the workman to capital, came to be attributed to economic liberty, Socialism arose as the natural reaction against the Liberal school.

It is impossible not to experience some surprise in considering how much ground has been lost of late by the cause of liberty. It is not very long since the word was always written with a capital letter, as was formerly the word "king". Liberty reigned an uncontested and incontestable sovereign. And even after the first deceptions had come, De Tocqueville wrote: "Do not ask of me to analyse this sublime sentiment; to know it you must feel it. It enters of itself into those noble hearts that God has prepared to receive it, filling and inflaming them. We must renounce the attempt of making it understood by those small souls that have never felt it."[1]

Now, on the contrary, in philosophy the so-called free will, by which man claimed to be his own arbiter, received its death-blow from determinism; in politics, that liberty once so ardently invoked, has been the cause of much delusion and discouragement; finally, it is to economic liberty that we attribute, though in most cases unjustly, a great part of the evils that afflict our present industrial system.

[1] See De Haussonville, "Socialisme d'État et Socialisme Chrétien," in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, pp. 840-841, 15th July, 1890.

The French workman, having lost all faith in liberty, has naturally dropped into Socialism.[1]

In Germany, on the contrary, the workman had been too long withheld from his share in political life, having no participation whatever in the government of the nation. And when, all unprepared for it, he finally obtained the franchise, the hopes he was led to conceive were too vast and too difficult to be realised.

Distrust in the effects of liberty is an evil much more common among Frenchmen than among Germans. The latter, partly from their historic traditions, partly from their social organisation, had never nourished that excessive confidence in liberal institutions. Many Germans make no secret of their sympathies towards the monarchical form of government. In Prussia, particularly, the king has long been regarded as the natural protector of the poorer classes against the tyranny of the bourgeoisie and the lesser nobility. The severity of the old feudal system has accustomed the German masses to obedient submission; the iron constitution of the old German industrial system has almost disposed them to a military form of social organisation. Consequently, although the National Liberal party numbers many of the richest industrialists and wealthy middle-class, it has never succeeded in winning the sympathies of the people, and German workmen are much given to discuss their own economic interests, while they pay little, if any, heed to political strife.

The exaggerated faith in State intervention now prevalent is but a continuation of the old popular confidence in the action of the sovereign.

Besides, the causes of the rapid diffusion of Socialism in Germany are very numerous, and are less due to the great inequality of condition and the unfair distribution of wealth than to certain historic and political agents. However, we cannot refuse to admit that the workman's condition is, in

[1] "In other words," said *Le Vingtième Siècle*, in answer to the *Revue Socialiste*, "Liberalism has had its day, and the question now lies between integral Catholicism and logical revolution."—*Vingtième Siècle*, p. 255, April-May, 1891.

nearly all cases, better in Germany than in Italy and Austria, but much worse than in France, England, Belgium, Switzerland, etc.[1]

The guild or corporation having since the French Revolution been abolished in France and England and in almost all European States, workmen and employers have, since the first half of this century, formed themselves into powerful groups, with totally different programmes. In nearly all the States of Germany, however, legislation has aimed at encouraging mutual accord between masters and men, yet without recognising the rights of the latter, or granting large concessions to the former.

This tendency of German legislation may be traced even in the recent industrial laws of the 23rd July, 1869, and the 18th July, 1881 (*die Gewerdeordnung*). By these laws the only associations recognised as legal and authorised were those formed among masters, which exercise a very large and comprehensive jurisdiction over the workmen, who may be admitted as associates, but only when in the employment of one of the members of the society, and always in a subordinate position.

It was most natural, as Cavalieri very justly remarks, that the socialist party should rise up violently against such a system.[2]

In Prussia, in 1875, in little over twenty-three millions of inhabitants, six millions had a yearly income of less than forty-two marks (about £21) (which, if we take the relative number of families into account, would be more than half of the total population), and more than two millions of landed proprietors barely held from half an acre to five acres of ground. And there are even now cantons in Prussia where the weekly wage for work-days of twelve and fourteen hours, runs not unfrequently below seven marks; this is largely confirmed by very

[1] See study by Arthur Raffaelovich, "Les Budgets d'Ouvriers en Allemagne," in the *Économiste Français*, p. 690, 28th June, 1890.

[2] See article by Cavalieri, "I rescritti socialisti dell' imperatore di Germania," in the *Nuova Antologia*, p. 690, 16th February, 1890.

exact statistics lately compiled by the *Gewerkvereine*, to which more than a thousand townships have contributed.[1]

Besides, owing to its historic traditions, the German people is inclined to expect much more from the action of the State than is either just or possible.

When the Lutheran Reformation stripped the Church of almost all the immense patrimony which she possessed, and which had been destined in great part to relieving the poor, many German princes felt the necessity they were under of recognising the protection of the working-classes as a duty inherent on their station. At first this appeared to be mere feudal protection, as, indeed, it was, but the spirit of the eighteenth century enlarged this conception of it, and Frederick II., in the preambles to his edicts on State reform, formulated a real system of State Socialism, in which he blended together the old German traditions and the liberal views of the encyclopædists.[2]

The *Preussisches allgemeine Landrecht*, compiled at his order, and published in 1794 by his successor, contains in reality the programme adopted by Christian socialists.[3]

[1] See Cavalieri, *I rescritti*, etc., pp., 688-689. On the distribution of wealth in Prussia, consult principally A. Sötber, *Umfang und Vertheilung des Volkseinkommen im preussischen Staat*, 1872-1878; Leroy-Beaulieu, *Essai sur la répartition des richesses*, chap. xix., etc., Paris, 1881.

[2] See the criticism on it by De Tocqueville, *L'ancien régime et la Révolution*, last chapter. The distinguished French writer shows how the code of Frederick is a combination of revolutionary principles, socialistic tendencies, and despotic traditions.

[3] Tit. xix., part ii. "§ 1. The State ought to provide with nourishment and maintenance all those citizens who cannot procure it for themselves, or cannot obtain it from those who are bound by law to furnish it to them. § 2. To such as have not succeeded in finding employment, work shall be assigned, adapted to their strength and capacity. § 3. Such as, from idleness or the habit of drinking, or any other vicious disposition, neglect procuring for themselves the means of subsistence, shall be obliged to perform useful work under the supervision of the authorities. § 6. The State has the right, and is moreover bound, to create institutions, by means of which it may equally prevent privations in one class and prodigality in the other. § 7. Absolute prohibition within the State of everything tending to encourage drunkenness, especially among the lower classes, together with all that which disinclines them for work.

If scientific German Socialism dates back to Fichte,[1] as a political party it is of much later growth. According to Lassalle's expressive phrase, the German masses stood fully as much in need of being made conscious of their misfortunes as of their rights.

But, besides the particular traditions of the people, and a hereditary faith in State intervention, other causes contributed to render the diffusion of Socialism in Germany very rapid. Until 1848, the German workman had been held in profound subjection, without the slightest participation in politics. "The institutions of the old *régime*," writes Laveleye, "had in part disappeared, but its spirit and influence were still dominant. The artisans were maintained and kept in check by the trade guilds. The great factory system was still in its infancy, while the rural labourers were as much under the influence of the nobles as the serfs from whom they had sprung. The modern proletarian was almost unknown. The lower classes had no idea that one day they might obtain the suffrage, and play a part in politics. Never imagining that their fate could be other than it was, they resigned themselves to it as in the middle ages."[2]

Nevertheless, the suffrage was granted to them on the eve of the war with Austria, when the socialist agitation was at its height, and the germs of Socialism had already been insinuating themselves among the masses for some years. The German workman, who was as yet unaccustomed to the healthy exercise of public discussions, unprepared for political warfare,

§ 10. The municipal authorities are bound to feed the poor inhabitants. § 11. They are further bound to take information as to the causes of indigence, and to point them out to the higher authorities, in order that proper remedies may be employed." The right of the poor to work and to assistance, and the obligation on the part of the State to protect the weak, and have care of their interests, are amply recognised.

[1] See Laveleye, *Le Socialisme Contemporain*, p. 8, 5me edition, 1890. Works on, or tending towards, Socialism, published before 1848, *e.g.*, Von Michael, *Abbruch und Neubau oder Jetzzeit und Zukunft*, Stuttgard, 1846; Friedrich Engels, *Die Lage der arbeitenden Classen in England*, Leipzig, 1845, etc., met with but scanty diffusion, and had a very limited influence.

[2] Laveleye, *Socialism of To-Day*, p. 6; translated by G. H. Orpen.

and burdened with excise duties and indirect taxes, who placed unlimited faith in the action of the State, and was allured by the flatteries of the Social Democracy party, was fatally drawn towards Socialism by the very conditions of his surroundings.[1]

The progress made by Socialism in Germany within the previous ten years was such as to render the action of the Government most difficult and complicated, and Prince Bismarck went so far as to say that France had, to a certain extent, become a more easily governable country than Germany.[2]

Since 1871, when they returned their first representative to the Reichstag, up to the present day, the German social democrats have made the most extraordinary progress.

Socialist deputies elected for the Reichstag :—

1871..... 1	1884..... 22
1874..... 9	1887... 11
1877.....12	1890.....36
1878..... 9	1893.....45
1881... 12	

Votes cast in favour of socialist deputies :—

1871.....101,927	1881.....311,961
1874.....351,670	1884.....549,990
1877.....493,447	1887.....763,128
1878.....437,158	1890.....1,341,587

At the elections of 1893, the social democrats cleared fully two million votes, winning a victory such as surpassed even the previsions of the most sanguine leaders of the party. Their progress is thus simply astounding.[3]

[1] On the causes of the rapid diffusion of Socialism in Germany see Cavalieri, *I rescritti*, etc., pp. 688 and 690; J. Rae, *Contemporary Socialism;* Laveleye, *Le Socialisme Contemporain*, pp. 7 and 8; Mehring, *Die deutsche Socialdemokratie, ihre Geschichte und ihre Lehre*, Bremen, 3rd edition, 1879; Wasserrab, *Sociale Politik im deutschen Reich, ihre bisherige Entwickelung und ihre Fortführung unter Kaiser Wilhelm II.*, Stuttgard, 1889; Boccardo, preface to Schäffle in the *Biblioteca dell' Economista*, vol. v., 3rd series; and particularly the excellent work by William Harbuth Dawson, *German Socialism and Ferdinand Lassalle*, London, Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1890.

[2] See Cavalieri, as cited above, p. 688.

[3] See the article by Maurice Potel, "Les Elections en Allemagne," in the *Revue Politique et Littéraire*, 15th May, 1890.

The famous laws of repression imposed by Bismarck, while still under the impression of the criminal attempts of Hödel and Nobling, did not serve in the least to check the rapid spread of Socialism. Now, in Catholic Bavaria alone, the socialists count two thousand two hundred associations, with one hundred and twenty-two thousand members, and there are over one hundred associations in Berlin alone.[1]

From 1878 till 1890 the votes given to socialist candidates rose: at Berlin, from seventy-five thousand to one hundred and twenty-six thousand; at Hamburg, from twenty-nine thousand to sixty-six thousand; at Munich, from five thousand to twenty-five thousand; at Magdeburg, from six thousand to seventeen thousand; at Frankfort, from four thousand to twelve thousand; at Königsberg, from one thousand to twelve thousand; at Hanover, from six thousand to fifteen thousand.[2]

This astounding progress has inspired the social democrats with a boundless faith in their own strength, and in the future which they believe awaits them.

After the elections of the 20th February, 1890, when the success of the socialists had already gone far beyond all previsions, the *Sozialdemokrat* (the principal organ of German socialism, which up to the present has been published in London, and of which thousands of copies have always found their way into Germany, in spite of the persecutions of the police) issued a number printed on red paper with a representation of the Revolution in the act of receiving the ovations of the working people, who cry out: "*The world is ours, let them do what they will!*"[3]

Unlike the greater part of French socialists, German socialists are not Utopists, lured on by delusive aims, nor do they live in a state of Buddhistic isolation, satisfied with tumultuous and unrealisable protestations, aspiring towards a new social order more or less Utopian, and confined to mere

[1] See the "Rivista del Socialismo," by A. Bertolini, in the *Giornale degli economisti*, vol. v., p. 162, Nos. 1 and 2, January-April, 1890.

[2] See the address delivered by Winterer at the Congress of Liége, in the *Gazette de Liége*, 9th September, 1890.

[3] *Ibid.*

speculative mysticism. They frequently display very practical tendencies, and follow a well-defined and precise programme. They are, for the most part, possibilists and evolutionists, and form a real political party of remarkable importance as to their numbers, and who do not fear to discuss in a practical manner, and often quite dispassionately, the interests of the labouring classes.

And not only has Socialism penetrated among the popular classes, but even among the well-to-do middle-class, and a good part of the aristocracy. One of the most conspicuous Liberal deputies of the German Reichstag, Ludwig Bamberger, observes very justly on the rapid process of infiltration by which Socialism has reached even the higher classes. "Germany," he says, "has become the 'typical land' of the war of classes. Doubtless, Socialism exists also in France, in England, in Italy, but at least all those whose interests are threatened unite to combat it. In Germany alone are to be seen numerous groups of persons, rich, noble, learned, and pious, declaring war against the bourgeoisie. Country gentlemen attack capital, no doubt, in hopes of improving their farming; professors declare that the road to opulence always passes near to the prison; and, finally, bishops conspire with demagogues. Here alone," he says, "is to be seen the strange spectacle of persons who, with aristocratic frivolity, make a pastime of undermining the foundations of social order, under the pretext of furthering the interests of religion and morality."[1] What most contributed to the development of Socialism was the long, fierce, violent persecution carried on by Bismarck. This man was the Diocletian of German Socialism, as William II. would now fain be its Constantine. Of a feudal temperament and violent character, and hostile to any kind of idealism, Bismarck hated above all things what he called the two *Internationals:* the red and the black, Socialism and the Catholic Church. The exceptional laws against socialists, exile, persecutions, and law-suits, have but served to unite all the disciples of Socialism into one solid phalanx, which, bound together by the common danger, by the same bond of misfortune, has

[1] Laveleye, *Le Socialisme Contemporain*, p. 95.

spread out more and more, till it has gradually become a mighty and powerful army.

The *Kulturkampf*, the persecution of the Catholics, the arrests of their bishops, and the confiscation of ecclesiastical property, have made the Catholic clergy warlike, able, and intelligent, training them for the struggle, and rendering them better and more active than in any other country in Europe. Thus, the wavering spirits were won back to the Church, and the Catholics became masters of new forces, which, but for the persecutions, they could never have acquired.

Nothing aids so much in diffusing an idea as a violent persecution.

In his war against Rome, Bismarck was obliged to retreat to Canossa, even before William II. very wisely removed him from power. In the war he waged against Socialism his arms failed him, and the party which, in 1871, could control barely one hundred thousand votes, became a few years later the strongest in numbers.

The Government had but three means of defence to oppose to the mighty socialist agitation: either to confine itself to the vain formula of the Liberal school, and to continue maintaining that economic liberty is the greatest of all goods, and that, like the spear of the mythological hero, it heals the wounds it produces; or to repress the socialistic movement violently and by force; or, finally, to adopt a large and sound programme of social reform, calculated to re-awaken in the labouring classes some faith in State intervention.

In Germany the Liberal school has never found many supporters among men of science; the "liberal" traditions of France are opposed to the character and tendencies of the German people, who are, on the contrary, inclined to place excessive faith in State intervention. Repression, the second means of defence, was then essayed, and gave but negative results. For, if the votes obtained by socialist candidates, which in 1877 had amounted to four hundred and ninety-three thousand four hundred and forty-seven, diminished, four years afterwards, in 1881, to three hundred and eleven thousand nine hundred and sixty-one, they rose again, in 1887, with

astonishing rapidity, to seven hundred and sixty-three thousand one hundred and twenty-eight, in 1890 to one million three hundred and forty-one thousand five hundred and eighty-seven, and in 1893 reached the astounding figure of two millions.

The third means, which was better suited to the character, traditions, and tendencies of the people, has now been adopted some years since, and the Government, accepting a good portion of the programme of the State socialists, has initiated a series of social reforms, a course of which it may justly be considered as the official pioneer in Europe. After extending its protection to women and children, through laws for the factories and various industries, it has sought, by means of a gigantic system of compulsory insurance, to guarantee the workman in case of sickness, old age, disablement, and accident.[1]

Whatever the economic and financial consequences of this bold attempt may be, we must, at any rate, consider the initiative taken by Germany as one of the most important social events of our century. The compulsory insurance system has not yet been working for sufficient length of time to permit of our judging it properly. The criticisms of liberal writers, especially those of the French school, are, for the most part, inspired by scientific pre-conceptions ; the pessimistic remarks

[1] In Germany compulsory insurance is regulated by the following imperial laws: (*a*) Law on *Insurance of Workmen in Case of Sickness*, 15th June, 1883; (*b*) Law on *Insurance in Case of Accident*, 6th July, 1884; (*c*) Law on the *Extension of the Insurance in Case of Sickness and Accident*, 28th May, 1885, which principally concerns workmen employed in the transport of goods, army administration, etc.; (*d*) Law on *Insurance in Case of Accident*, 15th March, 1886, which regards the functionaries and persons belonging to the army and navy, when exercising the functions of their position ; (*e*) Law on *Insurance in Case of Sickness and Accident*, for persons engaged in agricultural or forest work, 5th May, 1886; (*f*) Law on *Insurance in Case of Accident*, for persons occupied in building, 11th June, 1887; (*g*) Law on *Insurance in Case of Accident*, for persons engaged in navigation and maritime works, 13th July, 1887; (*h*) Law on *Insurance in Case of Disablement and Old Age*, 22nd June, 1887. For German works on compulsory insurance see Mazzola, *L'assicurazione degli operai nella scienza e nella legistazione germanica.*

of Leroy-Beaulieu and of Jannet are rather the fruit of scientific prejudice than of impartial observation.[1]

In France, England, and Italy public opinion wrongly attributes much importance to the influence exercised by the doctrines of the "historic or old school," and those of the "socialists of the chair" on recent German legislation.

Yet the so-called social laws—not all of which are, however, good or necessary—had their origin in two very distant and different causes. On the one hand, the German Government, perceiving that the laws of repression were of no avail, sought to win the love, or at least the confidence, of the popular classes. On the other, according to its old traditions, it believed it had a right to intervene in the economic relations existing between the various classes of society. When Bismarck wished to create protective laws, he did not have recourse to the economists, whom he included in his general contempt for all theorists, nor to the workmen, whom he suspected, but to Herr Stumm, one of the first industrialists in Germany. Herr Stumm is a man of most benevolent, but, at the same time, most despotic character; he is immensely rich and takes the greatest interest in the welfare of his workmen, but never tolerates their speaking of rights and assertions of claims. Though he abhorred the employers' liability law, less on account of its economic consequences than because of the spirit of independence it awoke among the workmen, he had all his men insured in one of the first insurance companies. And the workmen, seeing their old age provided for, became attached to their employer, and more willing to submit with docility to his demands. Now, when Bismarck sought to introduce his bill on insurance, instead of soliciting the aid of economists and theorists, he simply copied Herr Stumm's system, which had the singular merit of keeping the labouring classes under the guidance of the upper classes, while at the same time it provided for their most pressing material wants.

[1] This appears most evidently from the methods of criticism they employ. See Leroy-Beaulieu, *L'état moderne et ses fonctions*, pp. 367-386, Paris, Guillame, 1890; Jannet, *Le socialisme d'état*, etc., chap. v., §§ x.-xii.

But neither the congresses held by the *Verein für Sozial-Politik*, nor the doctrines of the "socialists of the chair," had, or pretended to have, the slightest influence on the bill. Schäffle was once consulted, but none of his views were adopted. Nor had Wagner or others better success.[1]

The economists of the so-called classic school have ever met with but scanty welcome in Germany; from the emperor down to the lowest workman all agree in considering that the State ought to intervene in the relations between capital and labour, and in the defence and protection of the latter.[2]

And the *Reichsanzeiger*, in an article suggested by William II., says: "In the face of the terror inspired by Socialism and by social democracy, and so as to ward off the evil that might accrue from employing the *laissez-faire* system against Socialism, it is necessary that all parties should unite closely into one, and, unearthing their arms for combat, should lay aside their disputes for power, and gather round the 'wearer of the strong and mighty crown,' the natural protector of all classes of society. Society is like to a pair of scales in the hand of the monarch: it is he who must now add, now withdraw, a small weight on one side or the other, in order to arrest the oscillations and to restore the troubled harmony."[3]

It is evident that, for some time past, William II. aspires to becoming the defender of the people's cause. "You are right," said he to the workmen, "in demanding social improvements. But these can only come from the head of the State. Put your cause into my hands; I both know your wants, and have the power to help you."

[1] See the excellent study by H. Saint Marc, "Étude sur l'enseignement de l'économie politique dans les universités d'Allemagne et de l'Autriche," in the *Revue d'Économie Politique*, April, 1892.

[2] On the origin, vicissitudes, and tendencies of State Socialism in Germany, see the recent and very accurate volume by W. H. Dawson, *Bismarck and State Socialism*, London, Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1890. See also Léon Say, *Le socialisme d'état*, Paris, Calmann Lévy, 1890; R. Della Volta, "Dieci anni di socialismo di stato in Germania," in the *Rassegna di scienze sociali e politiche*, 1st and 15th February, 1891.

[3] Reproduced in the *Association Catholique*, pp. 605 and 606, 15th May, 1890.

These words reveal a feudal education grafted on to a romantic imagination and a truly kind heart. But reforms in favour of the masses have been part of the programme of all the Cæsars of our century, whether Cæsar by birth or by adventure; and it now becomes evident that if these reforms are ever to be effectuated, and are to prove of real utility, they must instead be brought about *through* the people themselves.

Moreover, William II., alarmed at the animosity awakened among the industrialists by the plans of reform which he presented in 1890, has gradually withdrawn them. The last laws he imposed are considered by the working classes as tending rather to injure than to defend them.[1]

If the emperor understands his social mission in this manner, and believes that bold and resolute government alone can remedy the present social inequalities, the German Catholics are also full of confidence in the action of the State, but with this difference: they consider that a great part in such a mission belongs to the Church.

The French Catholic economists of the classic school persist in attaching a revolutionary meaning to the word "Socialism," and in believing that there can exist no point of affinity between Catholicism and Socialism, which, according to them, are two distinct and opposed terms, the latter of which can only be considered as the negation of the former.[2]

Now, on the contrary, there is nothing in Christian morality and the teachings of the Church that is in open contradiction with the morality of Socialism. Thus we have seen, and see every day, in Germany, England, America, and Switzerland, clergymen of the highest integrity declare themselves socialists, and even accept the theories of the most advanced Socialism. Meyer, Lösewitz, and Decurtins, who are convinced Catholics,

[1] See the interesting letter of the German deputy, Volmar, in the *Revue Bleue*, 18th June, 1892.

[2] See Hervé-Bazin, *Les trois écoles en économie politique*, p. 30, Paris, 1880; H. de Moly, "La règlementation du travail en France et les catholiques," in the *Réforme Sociale*, pp. 604 and 605, 16th May, 1890; Claude Jannet, *Le socialisme d'état et la réforme sociale*, p. 140, etc., Paris, 1890.

accept and maintain theories that are thoroughly socialistic, and the late Cardinal Manning, while he professed ultra-conservative tendencies in politics, accepted in economics the views and programme of socialist writers. And every day we see bishops who, if on the one hand, they protest against laïcised schools, an atheistic system of liberty, and the estrangement of the State from the Church, on the other, rebel violently against the abuses of capital, the subjection of the labourers to the moneyed classes, and the tyranny of the few who monopolise revenue. Indeed, a still more remarkable phenomenon is presented by some of the most notoriously conservative and ultramontane bishops, who in social economy maintain the most advanced and most radical theories. Monsignor von Ketteler, Archbishop of Mayence, belonged to the "authority" and feudal party; His Eminence Cardinal Manning, Archbishop of Westminster, was an ardent ultramontane; Cardinal Mermillod was also a convinced infallibilist, the enemy of all "lay"[1] liberty, etc., etc.

The German clergy were the first to interest themselves in the social question, and in dealing with it have displayed more daring, larger views, and superior competency than those of any other country.

The Lutheran Reformation had burst forth in Germany with the violence of a torrent; it was, moreover, the fruit of long preparation, and of a protracted process of incubation. Religious discontent, conflicts with Rome, and revolts against the Papacy had been very frequent for two centuries before Luther's time.

And so it happened with modern Socialism in Germany. It is now more than twenty years since it unexpectedly broke out with the violence of a torrent. Yet a careful observer will at once perceive that German Socialism is the necessary result of a long and uninterrupted "historic" preparation. Like the Lutheran Reformation it broke out with the violence of a hurricane, but its process of formation had been very long and very gradual, and whoever will but trace it up to its source will readily discover its true origins.

[1] By "lay" the author here means "hostile to religion".—Trans.

Even had they wished it, the German clergy would have found it difficult to withstand the socialist current. Not to have taken an interest in the social question would have alienated from them for ever the love of the masses. The interests of the Church, and the desire of winning the attachment of the people, their own Christian aspirations, and the time-honoured traditions of the German Church, all contributed in urging them to protect the cause of the greater number of the faithful, and to accept a large portion of the theories of Socialism.

So early as in 1863, when the socialist agitation initiated by Ferdinand Lassalle had reached its height, one of the most distinguished German divines, Dr. Ignatius Döllinger, warmly recommended the Catholic associations to take up the social question.[1] He was at that time one of the staunchest pillars of the Catholic Church in Germany, and the question of Papal infallibility had not yet come to alienate him for ever from the Vatican. Though he was a man of extraordinary learning and remarkable scientific acquirements, his political views were, however, extremely conservative. His fellow-countrymen considered him as the most rigid of Roman Catholics, and the bitterest and most powerful enemy of Protestantism in all Germany. In the assemblies of the German bishops he had ever shown himself as the most terrible adversary of the secularist or atheistic tendencies of the State, and the most violent defender of Roman principles. In 1848 Heine had abused him for these very tendencies :—

> Lebt er noch am Isarstrande
> Jener alte gottverdammte
> Erzpfaff Döllingerius.

"On the banks of the Isar," wrote the Jewish poet, "still lives that old arch-priest, accursed of God, Döllinger."[2]

The Catholic working-men's clubs, to whom Döllinger appealed, had been founded in great part through the generous

[1] J. Rae, *Contemporary Socialism*, p. 223; Laveleye, *Le Socialisme Contemporain*, p. 136.

[2] See the article by Ruggero Bonghi, in the *Nuova Antologia*, pp. 637-662, 16th February, 1890

initiative of Father Kolping, who, before entering the priesthood, had been a workman himself. Father Kolping had adopted the following motto: "Let there be no vain words, they irritate wounds; charity alone can accomplish all". In 1847, though still a poor shoemaker, he had founded in Cologne several Catholic journeymen's mutual relief societies, which were, in reality, associations for mutual improvement, instruction, and kindness. Each *Gesellenverein* had its meeting-room, an inn, and a hospice, where members who happened to be strangers in the city were sure of finding aid and hospitality. A clergyman was at the head of each *Gesellenverein*, the managing committee of which was further composed of two assistants and four supervisors, all of whom were workmen. When Father Kolping died, in 1865, after a life of honest labour, spent entirely among the people, there existed in all Germany four hundred *Gesellenvereine*, with eighty thousand members. At the present day the number of *Gesellenvereine* is over eight hundred.

But the Catholic socialist movement in Germany would have been cramped and have had but a limited effect, had it not been led, from so early as 1864, by a man of most remarkable energy and profound learning, Baron William Emanuel von Ketteler, Archbishop of Mayence. Carried away by the bold and ardent propaganda of Ferdinand Lassalle, he believed it to be his duty as a Christian and a bishop to interest himself in the social question, and in 1864 he published his famous book, *Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christenthum*, which had the greatest success among the clergy and the people. Monsignor von Ketteler, who was very noble-minded, and had a large experience of life, did not disdain to treat the labour question, setting aside most of the prejudices of his class, and accepting all that which he considered to be pure and sound in the morality and economic doctrines of Socialism.[1]

[1] On the life, doctrines, and influence of Monsignor von Ketteler, consult G.de Pascal, "La question sociale et l'épiscopat, Mgr. Ketteler," in the *Association Catholique*, vol. xxvi., p. 373; Begouen, "Le parti catholique en Allemagne," in the *Correspondant*, 10th April, 1887; "La question ouvrière et le christianisme, Analyse de Mgr. de Ketteler," in

Monsignor von Ketteler was born at Münster, on the 25th December, 1811, of a wealthy and noble family. He received a good religious education, and in 1824 went to pursue his studies in a Jesuit college in the canton of Vallais, in Switzerland. Having completed his course of classics, he dedicated his attention to legal and social subjects, and from 1829 to 1833 studied law and economy at the four universities: Göttingen, Berlin, Heidelberg, and Munich. It was at Göttingen, in one of his university duels, that he lost the point of his nose. In 1833 he served his year as a volunteer, and was for some time as non-commissioned officer in a regiment of Uhlans. In 1834 he first entered the Public Administration, in which he took part till 1837. On the 1st December, 1837, seven days after Archbishop Drost had been escorted out of Cologne by the police, Ketteler asked for six months' leave "to attend," as he expressed it in his demand, "to studies calculated to improve him in administrative matters". Instead of which he abandoned his administrative studies, and on the 26th May, 1838, sent in his resignation to the Ministry. The true motive of his giving up his place was, as he expressed himself in a letter to his brother, his desire to no longer serve a Government that demanded of him the sacrifice of his religious convictions. "The circumstances are such as would incline me towards the ecclesiastical profession, but I cannot make up my mind." During 1839 and 1840 he lived in Munich, where he was assiduous in his religious duties. Yet in his letters of that period no trace is to be found of his theological studies, nor, indeed, of any studies. He speaks, instead, of sport, and of the *Historisch-Politische Blätter*, an ultra-Catholic review then published at Munich.

It was Count Reisach, then Bishop of Eichstardt, and

the *Association Catholique*, vol. xvii., p. 152; Georg Wermert, *Neuere socialpolitische Anschauungen im Katholicismus innerhalb Deutschlands*, pp. 17 and 38, Jena, Fischer, 1885; Laveleye, *Le Socialisme Contemporain*, chap. viii.; J. Rae, *Contemporary Socialism*, pp. 248 and 252; A. Kannengieser, *Catholiques allemands*, pp. 19, 26, 213 and following, Paris, P. Lethielleux, 1892; A. Wirminghaus, "Le mouvement économique et social en Allemagne pendant les annêes, 1890 et 1891," in the *Revue Sociale et Politique*, No. 4., pp. 309-310, 1892.

subsequently Cardinal-Archbishop of Munich, who finally decided him to assume the ecclesiastical habit. Von Ketteler then dedicated himself to theological studies which were shared by his younger brother, Richard, who had served for some time as lieutenant in the Hussars, and by Melchers, who, like himself, had been referendary in the Administration, and who, later on, during the period of the *Kulturkampf*, was appointed to the Archbishopric of Cologne. He attended, in particular, the lectures of Dr. Ignatius Döllinger, from whose extraordinary erudition he drew no small advantage. In the autumn of 1843 he entered the Seminary of Münster, and was ordained priest, 1st June, 1884. Eager for combat, he soon took part in the political struggle, and in 1848 was elected to the Frankfort Parliament as deputy for Teklenburg. He soon made his mark in Parliament by his activity, and by the funeral oration he pronounced at the tomb of Prince Lichnowski and General Auerswald, murdered in an insurrection, 23rd September, 1848, and his speeches on the social crisis and the liberty of the Church speedily brought him into notice.

At the suggestion of Dr. Von Diepenbrok, Archbishop of Breslau, and of the Councillor to the Ministry, Von Ketteler was nominated Provost of St. Hedwig's, the most important Catholic Church in Berlin, and episcopal delegate for Magdeburg and Pomerania, 19th May, 1849. At Berlin he was instrumental in converting to Catholicism the Countess Ida Hahn-Hahn, who subsequently followed him to Mayence.

Professor Leopold Schmid had been appointed Archbishop of Mayence, 22nd February, 1849, but his nomination had not been ratified by the Pope. On the 24th February, 1850, the chapter of the cathedral proposed, instead, three other names, one of which was that of Von Ketteler, who was effectively nominated to the see of Mayence by the Sovereign Pontiff, 15th March of the same year.

During the long period of his episcopacy he made the clergy feel the influence of his austere and combative character. His own life was ascetic, irreprehensible and severe. He preached very frequently, heard confessions, and visited

his diocese several times in each year, animating his clergy, and striving to arouse them from their habitual inertia. In 1851 he invited the Scolopian Fathers to Mayence, in 1854 the Franciscans, and in 1858 the Jesuits. He had rather a quick temper, was strict with every one, and imposed heavy spiritual duties on his clergy. In short, he exercised his ministry with the utmost ardour. In 1851 he transformed the Seminary of Mayence into an excellent institution for theological studies. He founded Catholic Colleges in various cities of his diocese, and, among others, a very important one at Diesburg in 1859.

He also attempted, and with a certain degree of success, to regulate the relations between the Catholic Church and the Grand Duchy of Hesse, of which Mayence formed part. On the very day of his consecration, the Catholic bishops of the ecclesiastical province of the Upper Rhine, assembled at Mayence, had decided by common consent to regulate their relations with the respective States. And in March, 1851, and June, 1853, they formulated the demands of the Church in precisely identical memorials, which were presented to the different States. In 1854 Archbishop Von Ketteler published his work, *Das Recht und der Rechtschutz der Katholischen Kirche in Deutschland*, which, in a short time, had the honour of reaching a fifth edition, and was much praised and discussed. In 1854 he stipulated the conditions of a convention with the Grand-ducal Government. A bill on the same subject was presented in 1862, but was rejected by the Lower Chamber.

Monsignor Von Ketteler never occupied the seat in the Upper Chamber of Hesse, to which he had a right as Archbishop of Mayence, but was represented by Canon Christopher Moufang, who was likewise destined to play an active part in the history of German Catholic Socialism. He was several times offered a larger and richer diocese than that of Mayence, but he either refused to quit his post, or the Governments of the dioceses to which he had been called refused to convalidate his nomination.

Von Ketteler was throughout his career, as he styled

himself in a memorable letter to the *Kreuzzeitung*, a "Clerical Catholic," and in all the acts of his ecclesiastical life, in all his writings, and in all his undertakings, his one great pre-occupation was his immense love for the Church, and his desire to render her greater and more powerful.

Until 1866 he was considered as a *Grossdeutsch*, that is to say, anti-Prussian, but later on he accepted "accomplished facts," and, moreover, confirmed such acceptance in his book.

In 1869 he repaired to Rome to take part in the council. Like almost all the German bishops, he was contrary to the dogma of infallibility. But, not possessing a high degree of theological culture, he was not an opponent to be feared, and in discussion he frequently fell into contradictions. He had not found leisure in his agitated life to follow a thorough course of theology, and it was only in 1862 that the Theological Faculty of Münster named him Doctor, *honoris causa*. He opposed the dogma, but with the full intention of submitting should it be proclaimed. And, indeed, on the 13th July, 1870, he voted against it, and having obtained a private audience from the Pope, he threw himself at the Pontiff's feet, and repeatedly implored him to restore to the German episcopate its lost peace and concord.

However, when the dogma of infallibility was proclaimed, he was not one of the fifty-six bishops of the minority. He withdrew to Mayence, where he supported the action of the Pope with singular ardour, accepting through spirit of obedience all that the Vatican had decreed; he even wrote several pamphlets in defence of what he had formerly combated.

He did not act in this circumstance with the same noble pride as his great master, Ignatius Von Döllinger, who preferred to die under excommunication rather than accept a dogma contrary to the spirit of Christianity and the sound traditions of the Church.[1]

[Far from being "contrary to the spirit of Christianity and the sound traditions of the Church," the principle of what we now term Papal infallibility is as old as Christianity itself, and dates back, as all Catholics are, or ought to be, aware, to the day when Christ addressed to Simon Peter these memorable words: "And I say to thee: that *thou*

In 1871, after having addressed a long letter to Bismarck, in which he pleaded for the introduction into the German constitution of the articles relating to the Catholic Church contained in the Prussian constitution, Monsignor Ketteler accepted a seat in the Reichstag, as representative of the electoral College of Tauberlischafheim, in Bavaria. But he soon resigned it, making public the motives for his resignation in a pamphlet.

During the struggle between the German Government and the Church, he displayed the most admirable courage in defending the interests of the latter against the tyranny of the government, and issued numerous publications in support of his views on the relations between Church and State.

In 1877 he returned to Rome for the Jubilee of Pius IX. On his way home he fell ill, and halted at the monastery of Burghausen to visit an old friend of his childhood, Father Clement Von Korff, who, at the age of sixty-one, had taken the Franciscan habit. But the malady overcame him, and he died at Burghausen, unable to return to Mayence, 13th July, 1877. He was then aged sixty-six.[1]

When Monsignor Von Ketteler published his book on the *Social Question and Christianity*, all Germany took it up with the greatest interest.[2] It was the first instance of a bishop, noted for his Christian sentiments and his ultra-clerical views, taking up the defence of the labouring classes, with the same

art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My church, and the gates of hell *shall not* prevail against it". See St. Matthew, xvi., 18. It may also be as well to observe that Monsignor Von Ketteler fully accepted the *principle* of infallibility, only he considered its promulgation as a *dogma inopportune*. I have this information from a most reliable source, from a person who was the intimate friend and companion of the late Archbishop Ketteler.—Trans.]

[1] Many of the details in the life of Monsignor Ketteler were collected and kindly furnished me by Dr. Ferruccio Niccolini.

[2] Ketteler, *Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christenthum*, Mayence, Kirckheim, 1864. A French translation of it was published in 1869 at Liége, by Grandmont Donders, and an Italian version at Venice, in 1870, by the printer Merlo. The book, however, did not become known in Italy, as it deserved to be, owing, principally, to the ignorance of the clergy.

ardour, the same tendencies, and the very phrases of Lassalle himself.

He considered himself bound, as a bishop and as a Christian, to take an interest in the social question. On becoming bishop he had vowed to devote himself to the weak, the poor, and the unfortunate. Could he fail in such a promise? Christ, the Redeemer of the world, had not sought the salvation of men's souls alone; He had also sought to render their earthly life less hard and dolorous, whereas the Liberal writers who affect to be the friends of the people, have, in reality, but vain phrases to offer them.

The labour question is principally a "stomach question," and concerns the great majority of mankind. It is, consequently, of higher importance than the political questions, which, however, form the principal pre-occupation of our modern Parliaments. When political parties require to win the sympathies of the masses, they hold out the most flattering promises, only to forget them as soon as they have gained the day, and the people are left even poorer and more disappointed. How many politicians owe their reputation to these "dissolving views," that serve but to deceive the people, and bring them no real advantage!

As a rule, the great mass of the working people live on their daily wages. "Now, wages are determined according to the strictest necessaries of life, in the narrowest sense of the word; that is to say, according to what is indispensable to man for his food, clothing, and lodging, and the preservation of his physical existence. The discussions between Lassalle and his opponents have placed this fact in such evidence that it cannot possibly be denied without deceiving the people."[1]

Upon what does this condition of the workman depend?

"At the present day," says Ketteler, who fully accepted Lassalle's views, "labour is become a ware, subject to the laws that govern all other commodities. Wages, which are the price of labour, are consequently regulated as the price of other wares, by supply and demand. The price of goods is

[1] Ketteler, *Die Arbeiterfrage*, etc., p. 17, Mayence edition.

accordingly determined by the indispensable outlay necessary for production. But competition obliges the manufacturer to produce at the lowest possible cost, and, if he can, he will clear the market of all those who can only furnish the same article at a higher price. It also happens, occasionally, that to keep up a branch of industry that threatens to die out, and to prolong its otherwise impossible existence for some time, the producer sells under cost price; the inevitable consequence of such a course is collapse and ruin. And even when the price of goods is determined by the cost of production, the price of labour is regulated by the minimum cost of man's wants: his food, clothing and lodging. In order to get the better of his competitors, the manufacturer tries his utmost to reduce the cost of production; if there is an over-supply of labour the workman is compelled, as by a fatality, to limit himself even in absolute necessaries if he wishes to live. The manufacturer is master of the market, and demands: Who is ready to work for a minimum of salary? and upon this invitation the artisans vie with each other, according to the urgency of their wants, in craving a wage inferior in value to the amount of their labour. Finally, as for other commodities, comes an ill-omened day, when the human ware is offered for less than cost price; that is to say, if we would speak clearly, a moment comes when necessity compels the unfortunate workman to solicit a wage that is insufficient to provide for his most pressing wants and those of his family. Nothing, then, remains for him and his but to deprive themselves even of the strictest necessaries in the way of food, clothing and lodging, since his wage does not suffice to procure them. To be deprived of the strictest necessaries, even for a few days! What a depth of misery and suffering is expressed in this one phrase!"[1]

It is now impossible to question the fact that the material existence of the artisan, that is to say, of the greater part of humanity, is subject to the fluctuations of the market, and to the price of goods. Can there be anything sadder or more deplorable? "This is the slave market open throughout

[1] Ketteler, *Die Arbeiterfrage*, etc., pp. 17 and 19.

modern Europe, and regulated on the model fashioned by our enlightened Liberals and our humanitarian Freemasonry."[1]

What then are the causes of this disastrous condition of the working-class? There are two principal causes which influence all others: the suppression of all corporative organisation of labour, and the ever-increasing use of machinery, which tends to the development of the large manufactory system; these causes, while lessening the number of workmen, who, being able to dispose of a small private capital, can work on their own account, consequently increase the number of wage-earners. The Liberal party, which is, for the most part, composed of "adepts of Freemasonry, great capitalists, rationalist professors, and popular authors, who dine at the tables of the wealthy, in whose favour they are daily obliged to raise their voice,"[2] continually deceives the people with vain promises. "The abuses of free trade and free labour, upon which no check is ever put, and which no one ever attempts to limit, will prove far more hurtful to the masses than were the abuses of the corporations."[3]

"The remedies proposed by the Liberal party are based on a false principle. The inequalities existing among men are very great. It is a crime against humanity to have abolished all means of protection, abandoning mankind, with all its natural and social inequalities, to the daily struggle of competition." For the workman liberty is mere derision, inasmuch as it consists in his being free either to offer his labour at a minimum, or to starve to death when there is no need of his services.[4]

The Liberals speak of *self-help*,[5] and of the education of the people, and affect to ridicule the alms given by the

[1] Ketteler, *Die Arbeiterfrage*, etc., p. 20.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

[4] See on this subject the pamphlet by Monsignor Ketteler, *Liberalismus, Socialismus und Christenthum*, p. 20, Mayence: F. Kirckheim, 1871.

[5] See the brilliant criticism of the supporters of "self-help" in Ardent's *Allgemeine Staatsversicherung und Versicherungssteuer*, Leipzig, 1881; and the other work by the same author, *Die Reichsunfallversicherung*, Leipzig, 1881.

Church and the clericals; their superficial Rationalism has been unable to comprehend the supernatural side of Christianity and the teachings of the Church. Their finest talk about *self-help* will never convince the labourers that their condition is worthy of envy. The theories of infidel Liberalism will never prevent them from comparing their condition with that of their masters. Christianity alone, with its sublime teachings, can reconcile the labourer to his hard life, and dispose him to endure without resistance all that is painful in human toil. But *self-help* and *human dignity*, so frequently invoked by the Liberals, can do nothing towards rendering his chains less galling. The atheistic education which the State imparts to the masses only embitters their animosity. The wealthy infidel finds his satisfaction and solace in the good things of this life, but when he seeks to rob the workman of his faith in God and in Jesus Christ he unwittingly drives him to desperation.

Co-operative workmen's associations can give but poor results. The artisan who lives on a wage barely sufficient to meet his most pressing wants, cannot, as Lassalle has very clearly proved, find any advantage in similar associations. Associations of credit can only avail those who are at the head of some industrial enterprise, no matter on how small a scale it be; salaried workmen can derive no advantage from them. The same may be said of societies for the purchase of raw materials. They are of no utility to the salaried workman, who has not to supply the material. Besides, the advantages of the co-operative associations can have but a temporary effect; the artisan's condition remains unaltered in spite of them. Even Schulze-Delitzsch has unconsciously shown that the advantages of similar associations are purely relative.

According to Ketteler the Radical party is at least more logical than the Liberals, and Lassalle deserves praise for having depicted with cruel truthfulness the wretched condition of the working classes.

But the Democratic Socialists commit a grave error when they deny the right of property. Private property is founded on natural law, and on the eternal and unchangeable principles

by which it is governed. Nevertheless, when the State allows Materialism to be taught in the universities, thus training up youth in doubt, it is obliged to admit that the right of property, together with the laws that regulate it, is simply a positive right. How, then, can the State complain if a majority, composed of persons who possess nothing, claims a right to the property of those who possess, since everything is now reduced to a question of majority? If modern Governments only recognised the right of majorities, why should proletarians who possess nothing, yet form the greater number, not apply this right of majority to the revision of property? From the standpoint of the Liberal party and of university teaching the means proposed by Lassalle are in no wise illegitimate.

But they who believe in God do not consider the decisions of a majority so much as the question whether it has authority to decide. However, even the right of property has its limit. "Catholic theologians agree in teaching that the right of property cannot be extended to the point of being invoked against a fellow-creature in danger of starvation (*extrema necessitate*). This clearly shows what an immense influence theology and religion exercise over the right of property."[1]

The needy have a right to assistance, and the State may consequently impose a poor-rate on parishes and proprietors, without in the least violating the right of property. But were it to pass this limit it would be guilty of spoliation. In short, the State may tax the population to save the labouring classes from dying of starvation, but not for the simple purpose of improving the workman's condition.

But the Church has the faculty to do that which the State may not. Human activity would not even merit that name, were it restricted by the narrow bounds of legality which the judge and the tax-collector are obliged to maintain. Above and beyond all human justice stands the justice of God, subject to which man finds a judge in his own conscience, and fulfils certain works of charity which he considers as a sacred duty. At the present day the religious conscience is

[1] Ketteler, *Die Arbeiterfrage*, etc., pp. 77 and 78.

growing weak, and it has been found necessary to invent in its stead a complicated system of taxation and violence, which is working the ruin of almost every State, and leaves no room for free will and individual option.

Lassalle's productive associations are of a certainty the surest, most equitable, and most efficacious means of easing the workman's condition, while rendering it less insecure. But it is vain to hope, as did Huber, that the capital necessary to found these associations can be collected among the workmen, who, being subject to the iron law of wages, only earn what is strictly necessary for their daily sustenance. Their savings are so scanty and inadequate as to be only sufficient for the foundation of associations on a small scale, and of no practical utility compared to the extent of the evil they are intended to remedy. To have recourse to the State would indicate a want of confidence in individual initiative. The co-operative associations of production ought to be promoted by the Church with means supplied by voluntary contribution, thus appealing to the sentiment of Christian duty, which can never fail. In other times the Church beheld the nobles, animated by religious ardour, found and endow monasteries; why may she not hope to see, at the present day, the development of productive associations through the contributions of the faithful?

"May God in His goodness," cries the great Archbishop, "quickly raise up men who will sow the fruitful idea of the associations of production in the soil of Christianity, that it may there prosper for the good of the labouring classes!"[1]

Throughout his book Monsignor Von Ketteler employs the same phrases, the same ideas, and frequently the same words as Lassalle, whose demolishing criticism of our present industrial system he fully accepts. Even in his schemes for reconstruction he frequently agrees with the Jewish reformer, and sees no better means of aiding the working classes than by the adoption of the productive associations. He also, like Lassalle, ridicules the *self-help* theory of Schulze-Delitzsch. However, while Lassalle demands a hundred millions of thalers

[1] Ketteler, *Die Arbeiterfrage*, etc., pp. 144 and 145.

of the State to reform the present system of things, the Archbishop of Mayence, instead, hopes in the fruits of Christian charity.

Nor after the agitation provoked by Lassalle had subsided did Ketteler's desire of co-operating actively for the improvement of the condition of the labouring classes grow less. When, on the 25th July, 1869, he addressed a meeting of workmen at Liebefrauen, Monsignor Ketteler said: "The ungodliness of capital that exhausts the labourer as though he were a mere productive force, a machine, till it destroys him, must itself be destroyed. It is a crime against the working-class, which it degrades." And with energy worthy of Lassalle himself, he stigmatised the abuses of capital occurring in our present industrial system.[1]

However, although neither time nor disappointment could lessen his intense love for the people, and his faith in a future less unjust, less subject to bourgeois rule, the hopes he had conceived in 1864, when he published his book, *Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christenthum*, gradually died out.

In 1864 Monsignor Ketteler was convinced that the productive associations were the only means of improving the workman's condition in our present social system. He agreed with Lassalle in placing no trust in the illusions of Schulze-Delitzsch and the efficacy of *self-help*. But the Jewish agitator maintained that these co-operative associations of production should be founded by means of a subsidy of a hundred millions of thalers from the State. Monsignor Ketteler, instead, hoped that the sum might be collected through the voluntary contributions of the faithful.

His faith in the generosity of the faithful, his Catholic optimism, was fated to die out gradually under the pressure of daily disappointments. Though he continued to write and to interest himself in the social question, he never took up his first scheme again. And when, later on, a real Catholic Socialist party was formed, which had recourse to State intervention, and would admit of no other means of salvation

[1] This address of Monsignor Von Ketteler is reproduced in the Italian translation of his works, pp. 137-146; printed by Merlo.

than through the energetic action and financial aid of the Government, it may be that, though late in the day, the conviction came to him that in the labour question nothing can be more dangerous than to place excessive faith in the individual initiative of a class that must naturally remain conservative, because it is naturally forced to defend its own interests, nay, even its own privileges.

CHAPTER VI.

THE GERMAN CATHOLIC SOCIALISTS AND THEIR ECONOMIC DOCTRINES.

Bishop Ketteler's Success—Monsignor Von Ketteler and Lassalle—The Meeting at Crefeld—The Fulda Congress—*Die Christlich-Sociale Blätter*—The Bishops and the Social Action of the Church—Social Programme of the German Bishops—Catholic and Ultramontane Socialism—Christopher Moufang—Economic *Credo* of the German Ultramontanes—The Catholics and "Self-help"—Co-operative Societies of Production Subsidised by the State—The Catholics and *Manchestertum*—The *Christlich-Sociale Blätter* Group—Abbé Hitze and the "Quintessence of the Social Question"—The Duty of the Church according to Hitze—Effects of Machinery—Compulsory Guilds—Hitze's Scheme for Social Organisation—The *Zünftler* Party—Proposals of Hitze and Haberland—Hitze's Conclusions—Hertling—Ratzinger's Theories—Count Lösewitz and the Organisation of Labour—Criticism of Modern Society—Slave Economics—Modern Economics—"Self-help" according to Lösewitz—Roman Law and its Baneful Influence—The Alsatian Clergy and the Social Question—Free Socialists and Internationalists—Winterer and his Theories—The Amberg Congress—State Socialists and Catholic Socialists—Points of Affinity—The Guild System and the Catholics—The Catholics and the Intrusion of State Powers—Opponents of the Guild System—Monsignor Kopp—The Catholic Centre and its Social Policy.

MONSIGNOR VON KETTELER'S important publications had, as was natural, a wide diffusion. It was the first instance of a member of the nobility, archbishop of one of the most important dioceses in Germany, noted, moreover, for his absolutist tendencies and Christian fervour, having embraced Lassalle's theories, and having written against the modern economic system with the same severity, the same emphatic language as the Jew whom political men, with but few exceptions, considered a most violent and dangerous revolutionary.

However, even before Monsignor Von Ketteler's remark-

able book appeared, a large portion of the German Catholic clergy already shared Lassalle's views, openly professing themselves in favour of the Jewish agitator.

When the Countess Von Hatzfield addressed herself to Monsignor Ketteler, begging him to use his influence on behalf of Lassalle, who was then striving to remove the obstacles to his union with Helena Von Dönniges, on whose account he was finally killed in a duel, the Archbishop of Mayence received her with the utmost cordiality. She had also the satisfaction of hearing the illustrious prelate speak of Lassalle in terms of sympathy and admiration, as a man worthy of the highest esteem.[1]

And even when Lassalle, the democratic leader, mortally wounded in a duel fought on account of a faithless woman, just like the hero of any vulgar love story, expired in the greatest pain after three days' suffering, the German clergy received his remains in triumph. The Countess Von Hatzfield, who was devoted to his memory, had decided to have the great agitator's corpse embalmed and exposed to view in a public hall, but the Government, fearing some popular demonstration, forbade the carrying out of her plan, and Lassalle was buried in the Jewish cemetery at Breslau, with this simple epitaph: "*Here lie the mortal remains of Ferdinand Lassalle, thinker and fighter*". And notwithstanding the fact of his having been a materialist and a Jewish revolutionary, killed, moreover, in a duel, the Catholic clergy, who bore him deep sympathy, and sincerely endorsed a large part of the views contained in his economic programme, rendered funeral honours to the remains of the great agitator, such as are solely reserved to the most illustrious of the faithful.[2]

Ketteler's ideas spread most rapidly among the Catholic clergy; nor is there any wonder that a great impression was produced by the example of one of the most eminent prelates of the German ecclesiastical hierarchy, the most noted for his large views and dauntless courage, upholding in the name of

[1] See Cimone Weill-Schott, *La vita e le opere di Ferdinando Lassalle*, p. 134, Milano, 1889.

[2] *Vide* C. Weill-Schott, *ibid.*, p. 143.

Christianity those theories which politicians considered as subversive of social order.

The first meeting of the Ultramontane Socialist societies was held at Crefeld, June, 1868. Only three societies sent their representatives. Monsignor Von Ketteler's ideas were received with much reserve, and a resolution was passed to adopt as organ of the movement *Die Christlich-Sociale Blätter*, a paper then but recently founded at Aix-la-Chapelle by the Rector Schings. A second meeting was appointed for the following year, and when, on the 9th September, 1869, the assembly took place, it became evident that the agitation had already made great progress. This meeting was attended by a large representation of societies, almost all of which were agreed to adopt the same programme and line of conduct. Among the more important deliberations arrived at was the nomination of a permanent section, charged to encourage the rapid formation of Catholic social societies, whose aim would be to raise the moral and economic condition of the working classes. This section was composed of Vicar Grondheid of Münster, Professor Schultze of Paderborn, and Baron Von Schorlemer-Alst, the noted Catholic deputy for Westphalia, now leader of the Catholic "Centre".

During the same month a congress of German bishops, who met at Fulda, also studied the social question. The points which they discussed in relation to the subject were four:—

1. Does the social question affect Germany?
2. Can and ought the Church to interfere?
3. What are the remedies?
4. In what manner can the Church co-operate in their application?

And the bishops, agreeing with the most advanced of the Socialist party, recognised that the social question affects not merely one, but, more or less, all European States. Free trade does not allow small trades-people any chance of competing with the large commercial firms, and modern industrial society is governed in the most brutal manner by trade laws. From these two causes arise a mass of evils for the working-

classes: (*a*) Wages are regulated by the iron economic law of supply and demand; (*b*) the workman has no guarantee; (*c*) no hope of bettering his condition; (*d*) nothing to assist his spiritual and moral progress. And the evil is not limited to one nation alone. In Germany also identical causes produce identical effects. All things summed up, the workman "does not labour for himself but for capital. In the materialistic atmosphere that now pervades the modern industrial world, he merely counts as a ware, a live machine, yet all the while he is learning to consider himself as something more than a machine.

"Can the Church remain indifferent? No; she can and must hasten to the rescue; all her interests are involved in this question. . . . Were she to ignore the social question and limit her action to opposing to its dangers the usual exercise of her ministry, she would be wanting in her duty towards millions of souls, in that office entrusted to her by Christ."

It is, therefore, necessary to come to the assistance of the working-classes:—

1. By providing against misery and want.
2. By providing for the rooting out of vice.
3. By providing for the improvement of the moral and intellectual condition of the working-class.
4. By organising labour and wages so as to improve the workman's condition (increase of wages in proportion to length of service, profit-sharing, etc.).
5. By encouraging the workman to love his home.
6. By favouring habits of thrift.
7. By promoting harmony among factory people.
8. By endeavouring to maintain cordial relations between workmen and employers.
9. By alternating industrial and agricultural labours.
10. By protecting the morals of working girls.
11. By rendering it possible for mothers of families and married women to attend to their domestic duties.
12. By promoting legislation in favour of the working-classes, hence: (*a*) Prohibition of the labour of young

children; (*b*) limitation of the work-hours of growing youths; (*c*) separation of men and women in workshops, factories, etc.; (*d*) forced closing of all unhealthy workshops; (*e*) limitation of the hours of labour; (*f*) assurance of the Sunday rest; (*g*) granting of indemnities to all workmen who, without any fault of their own, become temporarily or permanently unfit for work; (*h*) granting local guarantees to trades unions; (*i*) ensuring the observance of the social laws by means of energetic State control.

The Church cannot and must not remain inert. She is bound, in the first place, to stimulate the zeal of her clergy in behalf of the working classes. If the priests who exercise their spiritual ministry in the industrial centres were but inspired by the same generous initiative as animated Father Kolping, how much greater would be the faith of the masses in the intervention and social action of the Church![1]

It was on the eve of *Kulturkampf*, and the clergy perceiving the falling away in the attachment of the middle-class, who were in great part favourable to the new Liberal ideas, felt all the more how urgent it became for them to win the affections of the people.

Indeed, according to Monsignor Von Ketteler and his disciples, the workman's labour had become a simple commodity (*die Arbeit ist eine Waare*) precisely through the theories of the odious *Manchestertum*, or Manchester school.

Was it not a consequence of these theories if labour, that noble instrument of civilisation, had come to be considered as a mere physical force? Do not the adepts of that school consider the laws that regulate the production and distribution of wealth as perfectly natural, and hence unchangeable? Is it not they who, with their Liberal prejudices, forbid all intervention in favour of the working-class? And again, in spite of every just law, in opposition to every principle of equity, do they

[1] An account of the Congress of Fulda was published with episcopal sanction in No. 10, 6th November, 1869, of the *Christlich-Sociale Blätter*, directed by Abbé Schings, which had been adopted the year before. at the meeting held at Crefeld, as the organ of the Catholic Social party.

not persist up to the present day in valuing labour just as any other marketable ware, the price of which may be fixed by a contract between two parties?

Property, according to the *Christlich-Sociale Blätter*, does not derive from labour, as the Manchester school maintains, but is a principle (*Moment*) which is not subordinate to labour in its origin or importance. It is, therefore, necessary to re-establish the guilds, to fix wages by law, to limit production, to institute a special magistracy for the application of the labour laws (*Arbeitsrecht*).

"It is easy," says Laveleye, "to understand the success which similar doctrines were sure to obtain among those of the working-class who had not yet been completely won over to the anti-religious and atheistic movement preached by the democratic agitators. They were simply the theories of Marx and Lassalle invested with a slight Catholic varnish, and connected by a few quotations with the teachings of the fathers of the Church. By attacking liberalism, political economy, and the modern industrial system, the ultramontanes, disguised as socialists, or sincerely converted to Socialism, won the ready adhesion of two very numerous classes, which the democratic socialists had been unable to secure. On the one hand the rural proprietors, and especially the small landed aristocracy, the country gentlemen who, having no share whatever in the increasing wealth of the large cities, beheld with envious rancour influence and money passing into the hands of the great manufacturers, bankers, shareholders, founders of joint-stock societies, and all those Stock Exchange speculators who now hold the most important positions in 'industrialised' Germany. This 'rural' party highly relished the denunciation of the abuses of capital, and rapidly became imbued with a species of reactionary feudal Socialism. According to them Marx had written nothing that was too violent against Industrialism. Be it understood, however, this agrarian party never dreamt of an agrarian law, but only of one applicable to the funds of the Stock Exchange, and to the Jews, whom they especially detested. The other category of adherents won by the ultramontane Christian Socialists was the Catholic

peasantry. The leaders of the *Kulturkampf*, the persecutors of their priests and of their faith, were liberals and economists. They were, therefore, but too glad to hear liberalism and political economy attacked. They found the burden of taxation and military service overwhelming, and Canon Moufang declared in his programme that these must be largely reduced. As to the 'iron law' and Ricardo, I suppose they took their bishop at his word."[1]

The programme of the Catholic Socialist party was drawn up later on, and with very large views, by a learned canon of the Cathedral of Mayence, the Domcapitular Christopher Moufang.

Monsignor Von Ketteler, whose generous and spirited character could ill brook opposition, was much attached to Moufang, who was his constant companion, perhaps, at times, his inspirer, and in whom he placed entire confidence. He had charged the canon to represent him in the Higher Chamber of Hesse, in which, as Archbishop of Mayence, he had a right to sit.

Born in 1817, Moufang had first studied medicine; later, at Bonn and Munich, he applied himself to physical science, which, however, he soon abandoned to devote his attention to the study of theology. No sooner did Monsignor Von Ketteler make his acquaintance than he learned to appreciate his rare intelligence and vast culture, and when, in 1851, he founded the great Seminary of Mayence, he appointed Dr. Moufang to the chair of analytical theology, and in 1853 nominated him canon of the cathedral. In 1862, Moufang, as the archbishop's representative, first took part in the Hessian Parliament, where he defended the interests of the Church and Ketteler's programme with much vigour.

Uncompromising, highly cultured, and of genial manners, he at once came into notice. In 1868 he was invited to take part in the committee then preparing the questions to be discussed in the Vatican Council, in which, together with almost all the German prelates of higher culture, he opposed

[1] Laveleye *Le Socialisme Contemporain*, pp. 145-155.

the dogma of infallibility.[1] When he perceived that his efforts were vain, and that he could not resist the current, he withdrew from Rome before the final promulgation of the dogma. Later on, however, though most unwillingly, he not only submitted, but, considering it most dangerous to the unity of the Church to keep up any cause of discord, he used all his influence in persuading other members of the clergy to recognise the dogma.

In the February of 1871, when he presented himself as candidate for the Reichstag, Moufang, in a very able address to his electors at Mayence, made a full statement of the programme adopted by his party. This address is known as the *Credo* of the ultramontane *Christliche Socialen*, and has since been for many years, with modifications of more or less importance, the programme of the *Christlich-Sociale Blätter* group, and of the Catholic Socialist party.

Although Moufang also takes his starting point from Lassalle's views, he differs, however, from Monsignor Ketteler in the fundamental question. Ketteler maintained that the only means of improving the condition of the working-class lay in the foundation of co-operative societies of production among the workmen. But while Lassalle insisted that it was incumbent on the State to furnish the capital necessary for these foundations, Ketteler trusted more in the voluntary contributions of the faithful. He considered that an appeal to the State implied a want of confidence in the well-to-do classes.

Moufang fully endorsed the demolishing criticism passed on the whole industrial system by his bishop; Ricardo's "iron law," the inefficacy of "self-help," are for him so many unquestionable truths, that do not even stand in want of confirmation. According to the learned canon, the workman's position daily grows harder and more uncertain. The Church can and must do much for him. She must diffuse the spirit

[I have been assured of the contrary by several persons who were in the intimacy of both Canon Moufang and Mgr. Von Ketteler; Moufang was not opposed to the *dogma*, and used his influence to the utmost to overcome the opposition of his bishop.—Trans.]

of love, justice and equity among the social classes, helping and assisting the poor and the weaker ones. But she alone cannot suffice for this task, and the State has still heavier obligations. The State should interfere for the protection of labour in four ways: by creating protective laws; by giving pecuniary assistance; by a just reduction of all military and fiscal burdens; finally, and principally, by limiting the tyranny and exactions of capital.

The State at present protects landed property; with the mortgage system it grants full security to creditors, and, by means of the trade courts, renders easy and rapid the solution of all commercial litigation. Since it thus protects the rights and property of all, why should it not in like manner extend the benefit of its protection to the rights and property of the working class? Now, as a workman's property is precisely his own labour, why should that labour not be protected against all industrial corruption and the "iron law" of wages, which exhausts the artisan only to abandon him to misery when he is no longer of any use? "The law," says Moufang, "protects the capitalist in his right to the interest due on his capital, and the workman's vital strength is certainly worthy of equal consideration. Supposing a speculator were to say to the capitalist who has advanced him money: 'There has been a crisis, a depression in trade, I am no longer in a position to pay you the high rate of interest agreed upon, I shall give you a third or two-thirds of the sum,' what answer would the capitalist make him? Why, he would refuse to accept any reduction, and for what reason? . . . Simply because he is well aware that the law supports his claim. But let us suppose the speculator saying to his workmen: 'There has been a heavy depression in trade, I cannot pay you more than a third or two-thirds of your present wages,' what resource is left to the workman? There is no alternative for him, he must either accept the pay offered him or throw up his place, which latter course means starvation. Why, therefore, should the law not guarantee the workman as it does the capitalist, protecting what is but right and just? There is no greater infraction of liberty in one case than in the other."

It is hence necessary, beyond any doubt, that the State issue protective laws. In the competition between industrialists the workman ought not to be defrauded.

Certainly the State is not bound to create associations, but it should aid and encourage their development, and, as in the middle ages, grant legal sanction to the statutes of all freely constituted labour associations. The prohibition of work on Sundays is a duty which religion imposes. Man is created in the image of God, and is no mere machine to be abused with impunity; he stands in need of a certain number of hours' rest and quiet, therefore the duration of labour ought to be established by law. The price of all goods ought to be regulated by the law of supply and demand, not by the *Arbeitskraft*, or workman's ability; the State is consequently bound to fix a rate of wages. When a master, seeking to increase his sale by lowering his prices, offers his men an inadequate wage, the workman is forced to resign himself to circumstances, and if he be in want,—he can beg! Are not these enormities of our industrial system in open contradiction with our profession of Christian sentiments?

The law ought not only to limit the labour of women and children, but should prohibit it absolutely. It is a great mistake to think that such labour really increases the resources of the family. A certain number of hours is indispensable in every species of production; if, then, a part of this work, instead of being done by women and children, were performed by men, the wages of the latter would naturally increase, and thus the sum of money coming into the workman's family would remain unaltered.

Factories and workshops are, for the most part, very hot-beds of corruption for women, where they lose those virtues which are the foundation of a Christian family.

The industrial anarchy which now predominates must come to an end. As there are civil laws, commercial laws, maritime laws, there should likewise be labour laws to regulate the relations between apprentices and masters, between employers and their workmen, and order should be re-established

upon the same principles, if not in the same manner, as it formerly existed.

The State daily advances large sums of money for railroad undertakings; why should it not furnish loans, on easy conditions, to encourage co-operative enterprise? It would naturally be necessary to use the utmost circumspection in order to avoid the danger of sometimes abetting odious speculations. But when it is a question of good and useful schemes, easily carried out and likely to succeed, why should not the State advance capital?

The injustice of the modern system of taxation is most obvious: the capitalist who has his millions placed at good interest, pays the State nothing, or next to nothing, while the workman, starving on his slender daily wage, is oppressed by fiscal and military exactions. Militarism, that plague-spot of Germany, drags several hundred thousand strong arms away from the fields and the workshops every year.

Wealth and poverty come alike from God; therefore, our warfare must not be directed against wealth, but against the infamous manner in which some colossal fortunes are now-a-days amassed. The millions thus acquired, without any trouble, and often without even the slightest risk, are wrung from the sweat of the working-class, who are in this manner forced to pay the interest on these immense fortunes, the fruit of speculations and enterprises that are often more or less immoral.

The State is in duty bound to set a check on the tyranny of capital, placing restrictions on all excessive speculation, and keeping a vigilant eye on Stock Exchange operations.[1]

Like Monsignor Von Ketteler, when speaking of the condition of the working-class, Canon Moufang is most eloquent, but in proposing the measures to be taken in aid of the oppressed poor, he often falls into errors and contradictions.

Were not the associations which he wished to see arise under the protection of the State, something similar to the

[1] Moufang's speech was published in the March number, 1871, of the *Christlich-Sociale Blätter*, and for many years formed the programme of the German Catholic Socialist party.

ateliers nationaux (national workshops) proposed by Louis Blanc? If so, why then did he invariably declare himself to be no partisan of these societies planned by Blanc?

The State ought, indeed, to place some curb on the rapid growth of the pretensions of capital. But what are the measures it should employ? The "tyranny of capital" is almost always deplored by those very economists who have anything but socialistic tendencies, but what can the State do to weaken it?

The master is the absolute arbiter of the labour market; when, in order to make a stand against competition, he sells his goods at the lowest prices, and reduces his men's wages, the latter must either accept the reduction thus forced upon them, or go begging. Now, how can the State induce industrialists to pay their hands a wage that exposes themselves to heavy losses? And, should the goods remain unsold, is the State in a position to open some new outlet to them? Still worse: can the State induce consumers to pay the producers an equivalent price for their goods? Would not all these unlikely restrictions probably end by hindering the development of any kind of production?

On the other hand, it is inexact to affirm that the same analogous relations exist between industrialists and workmen as between capitalists and contractors. "If," says Moufang, "one of the latter has contracted a debt towards a capitalist, he is bound to pay it, even when his speculation brings him but poor returns, while, on the contrary, he may reduce his workmen's wages as soon as he perceives that his undertaking does not succeed, or so as to be able to withstand competition." The analogy is, indeed, but apparent, for by the agreement he makes for the use of the capital the contractor binds himself to pay interest on a certain sum lent to him during all the time he retains the said sum, without attempting to profit by any depression that may occur meantime in the money market, whereas, in the contract for the use of labour, the industrialist calculates the work either by the week or the day, paying up, so to say, the capital at that term, and opening a new contract. The fundamental laws for the regulation of contracts are not,

therefore, violated in the least. Without admitting Moufang's argument, these considerations, however, naturally lead us to desire a greater stability in the agreements formed between contractors and the men they employ.

Thus Ketteler and Moufang are evidently dominated by the desire to emancipate the working-class from the fluctuations of the labour market, competition and the reckless abuse of speculation, and they consider the actual system not only unfair, but un-Christian, and opposed to every principle of social equity. Ketteler places much hope in the voluntary contributions of the faithful, while Moufang sees no other safe solution to the question than through the energetic intervention of the State by means of stringent laws. Both consider economic Liberalism, as professed by the Manchester school, as dangerous and hurtful as political Liberalism, and that the excesses of the Democratic Socialists are but the natural reaction against the excesses committed in the name of economic Liberalism. According to Moufang, the State ought to institute a regularly working commission, composed of magistrates and workmen, having full power to enforce the observance of its decisions, and which would fix an equitable wage for a medium day's work in each branch of labour.

It is very obvious that the two founders of German Catholic Socialism quite agree with other Socialists in their destructive criticism; they differ from them, however, in their schemes for the reconstruction of the social system.[1]

Around the *Christlich-Sociale Blätter*, founded by Schings at Aix-la-Chapelle, and afterwards inspired and led by Moufang, a staunch group of Catholic writers gradually formed, whose economic theories in no way diverged from those of the other socialistic schools, but who maintained that social reform must come from the initiative of the Church, and through her aid. Thus arose a real Catholic Socialist school, which still counts among its followers men remarkable alike for their talent and culture, such as Abbé Hitze, Count Lösewitz, a Protestant economist, converted to Catholicism and to

[1] Canon Moufang died in 1889 at Mayence, where he had been appointed rector of the Theological Seminary.

Socialism under the influence of Monsignor Von Ketteler's ideas; Professor Rudolph Meyer, who, when persecuted by Bismarck, was obliged to quit Germany and retire into Austria, where he founded the Catholic Socialist party; Ratzinger, the historian; Albertus, Hohenberg, Bongartz, Count Von Hertling, Jörg, etc.

The most eminent among these for his large views, scientific knowledge of the relations of social economy, and calm, just criticism, is Rudolph Meyer.

Canon Hitze, the actual leader of the Catholic Socialist party in the Reichstag, and who, since the death of Monsignor Ketteler, Moufang's withdrawal from Parliamentary life, and the exile of Meyer, is the first and most noted of the Catholic German economists, has for some years treated the social question with great success. His theories have not only been recognised and admitted by the greater part of German Catholics, but, crossing the frontier, have met with approbation among the Catholics of Switzerland, Austria and France.

Like Ketteler and Moufang, Hitze considers that the Church is bound to interest herself in the social question. In his address to the German Catholics, at the congress held at Freiburg, in Breisgau, the learned canon exclaims: "Let us even suppose we wish to remain strangers to these questions, can we say: 'In what manner do they concern us?' Certainly they are new to us, and the traditional teaching of our school leaves us unprepared to meet them; we are as yet in the preparatory stage. The principles, indeed, are old; they were expounded in masterly fashion by St. Thomas; the principles of interest and usury, property and labour, justice and charity, law and government, are all of ancient date; what is new to us is their present application and development. Who would ever dream of comparing our age of railroads and steamboats, of great enterprises and vast cities, with the times in which St. Augustin wrote his *Civitas Dei* and St. Thomas his *Summa?* Economic and social catastrophes have imposed new duties upon those who are charged with the care of souls, opening up new paths to their labours, and in vain do you seek for explanations and solutions to these new conditions of

things, in works treating purely of philosophy, morals and religion. If you wish to be equal to your high mission, you must study the problems of the present day, and learn in teaching as you will teach in learning; even should you consider this method a dangerous one, yet must you adopt it, for time presses and the need is truly urgent.

"Yes, we must study these social questions, we must know them and teach them in order to be able to distinguish between what is just and what is unjust; we must place ourselves in a position to be able to discern and recognise which are legitimate demands, and be ready to support them and to oppose all injustice. Error is most dangerous when it is apparently founded on a legitimate basis; there are many legitimate demands even among the exaggerations of Socialism which have been corrupted into errors. The best means for defeating democratic Socialism is to take up its truths, eliminating from them what is erroneous.

"We must also render our teaching of social economy conformable with the teachings of our faith, loudly proclaiming our Christian ideal in the midst of the errors and confusion of the social question, and showing clearly how the modern economic developments may and must conform to that ideal. We hold the Belgian clergy in very high estimation on account of their theological erudition and the integrity of their morals, but the evils produced in Belgium by the adoption of the Manchester theories could never have been possible had they been led by a bishop like Monsignor Ketteler, or had they displayed, some twenty years earlier, the same zeal and intelligence in treating the social question, as they now put forth under the enlightened direction of the venerable Bishop of Liége.

"We are bound to study the social question, and the word of God will lend its own strength and expression to the social conditions of the day. Read the sermons of St. John Chrysostom; all the social conditions of his time are fully elucidated in them. Vehement discourses on marriage and on Christian domestic life will bear but small fruit if they take not into consideration our present social conditions. Show, then,

where lies the social danger, point it out as the peril that must be avoided. If you can but obtain from the young couples contemplating marriage a promise that the girl shall cease to work in the factories, so as to be able to dedicate all her leisure to the coming responsibilities of the management of her family, you will be accomplishing in a far more practical manner that sacred mission imposed on you by your charge of souls."[1]

Hitze openly separated from a number of his friends. According to him, economic liberty is not only the greatest danger that threatens modern society, and the greatest evil from which the working-class have to suffer, but the sole means of re-establishing social tranquillity consists in a return to the old corporative institutions.[2]

In his pamphlet, *Die Quintessenz der Socialen Frage*, written in Rome, January, 1880, the learned canon summed up his social doctrines with much clearness.

According to him the social question is essentially economic; though other factors contribute in determining social crises, yet the root of the evil ever lies in our economic system.

"Never did any form of society, while professing Christian principles, permit such maxims and customs to be introduced into its economic system as those which actually disturb our present society. The social question is fundamentally one and the same thing with that of the transformation which the introduction of machinery brought about in our economic

[1] *Vide* the *Association Catholique*, p. 330; 15th March, 1889.

[2] The principal works published by Canon Hitze are: *Die Sociale Frage und die Bestrebungen zu ihrer Lösung*, p. 320, Paderborn, 1877; *Kapital und Arbeit und die Reorganisation der Gesellschaft*, p. 594, Paderborn, 1881; *Die Quintessenz der Socialen Frage*, p. 32, Paderborn, 1888; *Schutz dem Handwerke*, p. 146, Paderborn, 1883; *Pflichten und Aufgaben der Arbeitgeber in der Arbeiterfrage*, p. 90, etc., Cologne, Bachem, 1888. See also the numerous articles published in the *Arbeiterwohl;* see also the article, "Secours au métier," in the *Association Catholique*, vol. xx., p. 667. After the issuing of the imperial rescript on the social question, Abbé Hitze published another work no less important than the preceding: *Schutz dem Arbeiter*, Köln, 1890.

régime, and, consequently, in our social relations. It may, therefore, be defined as the search for a social system corresponding to the modern conditions of production in the same degree as the social systems of the middle ages corresponded to the simplicity then existing in the conditions of production in towns and cities, as well as in the rural districts."

The effects of the introduction of machinery have been to cause a most rapid increase in industrial production. But the machine produces *en masse*, consequently its products must find an extensive market, hence the necessity of free trade, which demands free and floating capital, together with free, salaried labour.

Thus, as capital employed in industrial pursuits, unlike that which is invested in landed property, produces its own increment, industrial aristocracy continually tends to supersede landed aristocracy. The smaller capitalists are daily absorbed by the great ones, who are favoured by free competition, and are reduced to the necessity of joining financial societies, which are likewise at the mercy of the great capitalists. Capital is gradually growing more and more independent of enterprise, and anarchy in production is on the increase. The industrialist no longer produces for his customers, but for the public at large. Production, thus increasing beyond all bounds, not only passes the limits of consumption, but passes them to a very great extent. Competition, consequently, grows all the more terrible, and the working-class, becoming constantly more impoverished, buy less and less. As they form, moreover, by far the most numerous category of purchasers, every species of proportion between supply and demand is thus destroyed. In this manner the economic crisis is no longer a mere passing phenomenon, but a normal and established fact. Such capitalists as are in a position to foresee it shut up their purses at the first symptoms of panic, and the enterprise which subsisted solely on credit is doomed to perish. Then, when everything has sunk to the lowest grade of depression, capital, urged on by its absolute need of activity, and still more by the wants of demand, which again begin to be felt, flows anew into the industrial market, lending itself to the most hazardous specu-

lations. And so on, from panic to reaction, these fluctuations constantly pass all the limits of proportion. Truly speaking, the capitalist is the real master of our industrial companies, for all contractors, masters, and workmen are alike dependent on the good pleasure of capital.

Nor has the machinery system produced less grievous effects in morals and politics. The very organisation of the family is undermined on its own hearth by the centralising system consequent on the introduction of machinery. Little by little the machine-system from being cramped up in workshops has demanded the development of large factories, and finding the small towns insufficient for its activity, has required the space of great cities, has overrun the whole State. Yet a little, and we shall see it finding one nation too narrow for its expansion, and shall have international capital opposed to international labour. In this course of levelling and centralisation, Socialism and Liberalism go hand in hand. The sole difference between their action is, that while Liberalism would have all men equal in their rights, Socialism wants them to be so in fact as well. In opposition to "equality before the law," in favour of an oligarchy, Socialism claims equality before the budget to the benefit of democracy. Now, the logic of facts, as well as that of ideas, is in favour of the Socialists, for the present system of production has already lost all individual character, becoming, instead, socialistic; the path along which it is rushing is no longer that of liberty, but of Socialism, which latter needs but give a semblance of legality to the movement of facts, and it has won the day. "Socialism looms in the future as the fatal goal of evolution."[1]

It is not the machine that serves the workman, but the workman who serves the machine; he becomes, in a way, *mechanised.* The machine, which stands in no need of rest, exacts his labour on Sundays and during the night, and, as it does not require any great physical exertion to put it in motion, robs him even of wife and children. Finally, for this mechanical existence, which reduces him to its own image,

[1] Compare Hitze, *Die Quintessenz der Socialen Frage*, p. 19.

the machine only pays him at a rate much inferior to what he could earn by hand-work when he had a trade.

The progress of the machinery system has been most rapid, and has now invaded every branch of production ; agriculture, and even the fine arts are becoming mere industrial questions, and must submit to the same conditions as any other industrial production, the same fluctuation of capital, the same mortgage system of credit, the same unlimited international competition. All this destroys the workman's real activity, and places him in an unendurable position. And to render this still harder the State in many cases imposes upon him compulsory school attendance, military service, and a heavy burden of taxes.

Thus it is that Socialism finds the soil ready prepared, if not for its applications, at least for the assertion of the rights of labour.

We must seek the remedy for such grievous and deep-rooted evil, not in liberty, which in the social order has but a negative action, but in Socialism itself. Liberty has destroyed the corporations, opening up the path to the modern industrial system in their stead. A new order of things must yet arise, analogous to the old one, but on a much vaster scale. The social theories of the middle ages will always be true, and their realisation, adapted to the new wants and economic tendencies of our times, will hasten the return of social tranquillity. The organisations of the future must be wider and more democratic than the old ones, nor must we imagine that these organisations can spring up instinctively and spontaneously, as in the middle ages; we must place some faith in the action of the State which invites the various interests to unite for the common good. There may, doubtless, be some danger in this interference of the State, yet it is impossible to hope for any lasting result without its aid.

The Democratic Socialists want to level everything, to reduce everything to mere mechanism ; they would have the State paramount, taking completely into its own hands all production and the distribution of produce. This extreme consequence of socialistic principles can be justified neither by right nor by facts.

The solution of the social question lies in the *social organisation of trades.* The trades corporations or unions were, during the middle ages, thorough social organisations. Now, the only means of placing some sort of control on the abuses of capital, and the evil wrought by machinery, is to render the progress made in the means of production profitable to every one.

It is vain to dream of free corporations.[1] A free corporation or guild is a blade without strength, with which it would be impossible ever to aim a serious blow against the tyranny of capital; every regulation supposes some restriction; he who says obligation says restraint.

Unions formed among small trades-people and manufacturers can be of no utility. The competition of one large shop or factory suffices to ruin them.

Whereas the corporative system is strong enough to protect the rights of labour, endowing it with all those economic institutions for which mere individual initiative would be quite insufficient.

But the corporative system ought not to be re-established for the trades alone, but for agriculture both on a large and small scale, and for all extensive manufactures and property. In all this lies a strong economic and political interest.

The corporations can further assure us the only electoral system that can reconcile property and universal suffrage, as it is no less democratic than the latter, while offering fully as many guarantees as the former system. Thus only will the working-classes be enabled to have their own representatives, and the way will be paved for useful transformations in the future.

What is more specially important is the organisation of the larger industries. Society has become aware that there is great need of some proper regulation of production, which is at present in a state of disorder, almost anarchy. The

[1] As we shall see further on, the Pope, in his Encyclical letter, *Humanum genus*, expressed his belief that social tranquillity may be restored by returning to the guild system, "appropriated to the requirements of the present day".

liberal Doctrinaires and the "enlightened bourgeoisie" have given ample proofs of their insufficiency in not attempting to solve this great problem of our modern times.

We must strive to render the position of the hired workman less precarious, creating a greater reciprocity of duties, a greater mutual responsibility between employers and employed. Our times, being called "democratic," can no longer countenance the fact of the workman being considered as a mere ware, to be bought and sold according to the fluctuations of the market. The working-class have a *droit au travail* and to a just participation in the profits of national capital.

The agriculturists seem to be less willing to adopt the corporative system; certainly the labourers of that class are as yet too circumscribed and too independent to feel the want of such an organisation. But, once allow industrialism to invade agricultural production, let the introduction of chemical science and machinery become more accentuated in the rural cultivation system, and we shall see even the peasant population have recourse to the corporative *régime*, as it alone can place science, machines and credit within their reach, open up to them, in a word, the various industries, and keep up the market.

A social organisation of the various trades must be considered as the necessary prelude to the solution of all the social questions. Such an organisation would naturally exercise a large influence on political life, giving the real wants of society that place before the public attention which is now occupied by the idle phraseology of the different parties. Political spirit will then naturally become conservative, and bureaucracy, and despotism high and low, will find some one to place a check on their actions.

Hence Canon Hitze reaches the following conclusion: "The actual system of production, which in practice inclines more and more towards Socialism, demands the means of expressing itself fully, in right as in fact, by a suitable legal organisation inspired by social principles. The reign of Individualism and Liberalism is in reality nothing else than the reign of despotic hypocrisy, which satisfies neither the

wants of the community at large nor the interests of production. The future belongs to Socialism, whether it be absolute Democratic Socialism tending to revolutionise the State, or the healthy, conservative, relative Socialism of the trade corporations. A *social organisation of the nations* is the only possible safe solution of the social question."

Nor does it astonish us that Hitze should see no other safe path than by returning to the old corporative systems adapted to the requirements of new times. In Germany the corporations have withstood the shock of the liberal ideas and economic tendencies of our day. These institutions are deeply rooted in the historic traditions of the German people, and for many centuries all German industry and manufacture have been based on the corporative system; only in 1868 were the corporations or guilds legally deprived of the privilege which they had enjoyed for many centuries, of being able to exclude from the exercise of a trade all those who were not members of a guild, while, at the same time, all manufacturers were allowed to hire workmen and apprentices without any restriction as to numbers.[1] It was only in 1871 that it was ordained by law that the old corporations would be retained in the empire, but deprived of their former privileges and of any sort of character of a public institution, and reduced to mere commercial associations of autonomic industrialists, united for the administration and furtherance of their mutual interests.

But a very great reaction took place throughout the empire. Economic troubles ensued, and were falsely attributed, in almost all cases, to the abolition of the corporations; and the *Zünftler* party went on increasing. Ten years later, in 1881, the Diet passed a bill presented by Ackermann, by which the old corporative institutions re-acquired their former character of autonomic industrial associations, founded on the public laws,

[1] *Vide Noth-Gewerbe Gesetz*, Art. 1. "The right which belonged to the guilds of excluding others from the exercise of a trade, is now abolished." Art. 3. "It is lawful for every industrialist to hire workmen and apprentices in such numbers as best suit him; the workmen and apprentices are perfectly free in the choice of a master or head."

subject to administrative authority, and having in view the protection of the public interests.[1]

As, however, the greater number of workmen were excluded from these associations, another bill was passed on 6th July, 1887, granting to the administration the right to oblige even such masters as did not belong to the corporation to contribute to the expenses incurred in providing lodgings for travelling workmen (*Herbergen*), for institutions for imparting technical knowledge, and for the founding of courts of arbitration.

These provisions were really the prelude to the formation of the compulsory guilds, and after a most animated discussion, 1st March, 1888, the Reichstag, by 115 votes against 114, approved of a bill presented by Canon Hitze and the deputy Haberland, which imposed on each workman the obligation of passing an examination in professional capacity, before a special commission of each corporation of his district, previous to being legally empowered to exercise his trade.

[1] According to the *Gewerbe-Ordnung für das deutsche Reich* of 1884 the duty of the new corporations was: (1) To defend the spirit of community and maintain the honour of the trade; (2) to protect the maintenance of peaceable relations between workmen and masters; (3) to regulate the organisation of apprentices, providing for their technical, industrial, and moral education; (4) to settle all questions between workmen and masters, touching their industrial relations, the workmen's books, etc., when the decision should lie with the municipal authorities (art. 97). They are further authorised as regards industrial relations: (1) To found and direct special schools for apprentices; (2) to make special provision for the improvement of master-workmen and boys; (3) to hold examinations for them, giving them attestations of the manner in which they passed; (4) to institute an establishment in common for the exercise of the trade; (5) to found a relief fund or bank for the assistance of the members, their families, workmen, and apprentices, in case of illness, death, inability for work, and other casualties; (6) to establish arbitrators for the settling of all disputes between workmen and masters (art. 98). The statute must be approved of by the public authorities, and must contain dispositions for obliging apprentices to frequent the trades-schools, for the formation of arbitrations, the admission, retiring, and exclusion of members, the hours of labour, the administration of property, etc. Admission to the corporation cannot be forbidden any one in the enjoyment of his civil rights, or who is not under guardianship, and has already been an autonomic contractor or master. The institution is clearly of a public character.

During the same session of 1888, besides the bill due to the initiative of Hitze and Haberland, the Reichstag passed a number of others tending to protect labour: a minute regulation of women's work; the prohibition of night-work for women and minors under the age of sixteen; a stricter limitation of children's work; a general and absolute prohibition of all work on Sundays and festivals. It had finally invited the Government to fix a legal maximum working day for adults, and to regulate home industries.

These bills, which, if applied, would, in the beginning at least, have created a revolution in industrial pursuits, caused a real panic among the manufacturing class. And the strong *Central Verband deutscher Industriellen* opposed them in such manner that the *Bundesrath*, without even attempting to select what was really good among them, rejected all the measures already voted by the Reichstag, and together with them, consequently, the bill brought in by Hitze and Haberland.[1]

Hitze, who was a bold writer, always well-informed and exact, did not hesitate before the consequences to which his theories urged him. The conclusions we may gather from his numerous works, so rich in erudition and so full of prudence, are, in the main, as follows:—

1. The social question differs from the religious question, without being independent of it.

2. The social question can only be solved by means of a re-organisation of labour.

3. This re-organisation must recognise and protect the rights of labour.

4. It must, consequently, accept the fundamental principle of Socialism.

5. It can only be accomplished on the condition of being made compulsory for all trades and professions, that is to say, it must form part of the political institution, as well as of the economic system of the nation.

6. It cannot, therefore, in a nation composed of members of different religious confessions, be in any way confounded with religious organisation.

[1] *Vide* Jannet, *Le socialisme d'Etat et la réforme sociale*. pp. 168 and 169.

7. Finally, every one, even among those divided by religious and political questions, ought to make this re-organisation of society the aim of a common social programme.[1]

Canon Hitze never for a moment hesitates in following out his theories to their extreme consequences; he is a convinced socialist, and considers that Socialism, understood in a large and Christian sense, is the future towards which our modern society is tending.

"Alms are but a poor remedy, so long as the claims of the 'fourth estate' remain unsatisfied. This class claims *its rights* and not alms; alms should only form an exception. The workman naturally considers as an enemy whoever refuses to admit his claims."[2] Besides this, where is the utility of charity? "*Good-will* is not enough; charity is not and never can be enough in a social organisation founded on competition and rivalry, and in which charity is but too frequently rewarded with failure, and may be justly called the reward of hardness of heart."[3] Besides, "all these *nostrums* of good-will, etc., cannot cure our social malady. Charity and alms-giving may mitigate cases of individual misery, but can be of little avail in the great social ills. Therefore: no alms nor personal aid, but *organised* personal aid."[4]

None of the Catholic deputies of the German "centre" have a clear and explicit programme like that of Hitze, nor are they, like him, able to rise above the prejudices of the people and clergy, who persist in believing in a species of Catholic *Manchestertum.*

Since the fall of Bismarck and the death of Windthorst the abbé's position has gained much in importance. The Catholics place the greatest faith in him, and hope much from his action, and though only a simple priest, and still under forty, he has been called by the emperor to take part in the Council of State.

[1] Compare *L'association catholique*, p. 667 and following, 15th December, 1885.

[2] Hitze, *Die Sociale Frage*, p. 314.

[3] Hitze, *Kapital und Arbeit*, p. 234.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 451.

In his last book on the protection due to the working-classes, which may be said to be an able and comprehensive paraphrase of the Imperial Rescripts, Hitze demands, above all, a strict regulation of labour, from which he appears to expect much good result. In this work the young abbé does not confine himself to a large and intelligent criticism of the present labour system, but with much judgment and most uncommon competency proposes reforms which might be effected.[1]

As early as in 1878 Baron Von Hertling, in a speech delivered before the Reichstag, traced out the social programme of the Moderate Catholic party.

"Do the Confederate Governments," said Baron Von Hertling, in the course of his interpellation, "fully intend to continue legislating in favour of reforms concerning factories, etc., in order to suppress as much as possible all labour on Sundays, to place a limitation on the labour of women, and to prevent the duration of men's work-hours from becoming excessive; finally, do they intend to publish instructions relative to the precautionary measures to be adopted for the protection of the workman's life and health, investing all factory inspectors with full authority to enforce the observance of these instructions?"[2]

In supporting his interpellation, Von Hertling likewise began by noting the pitiable condition of the working-classes, and more particularly the precarious position of industrial hands. In speaking of the workman he says: "He is reduced to accept work wherever he finds it, without considering whether the wage be high or low, whether the work is likely to last only a short time or be prolonged without measure, whether the conditions of the workshop be hygienic or otherwise. Such is the industrial solidarity which facility of communication has established in the civilised world, that the fluctuations of the international market push the workman to the last extremes. But too truly is it said that labour is a

[1] Abbé Hitze, *Schutz dem Arbeiter*, Cologne, 1890.

[2] See the *Association Catholique*, p. 176 and following, 15th August, 1882.

mere ware, of which the workman disposes, and that he is continually in the position of a tradesman forced to sell at any price. The encouragements held out to him to induce him to acquire saving habits have, up to the present, proved almost completely sterile, as they have not, so far, met with the support of any solidly founded institution. It is rare that, during any considerable space of time, a workman's wages exceed what is necessary for his support. Besides, when we encourage him to lay by money we always suppose him to possess a certain moral superiority, which the example of his employers is often far from calculated to teach him. Then come the oscillations of the market, periodical crises, stoppage of work, and diminution of wages."[1]

Now, the action of the State alone is not sufficient to remedy all these evils; nevertheless, the State is bound to interfere whenever there is question of protecting the inalienable right which every son of the people brings with him at his birth, whenever there are conflicting interests to be reconciled, or whenever it is requisite to interfere on behalf of any legitimate social movement. Woman, to whom is entrusted the sacred duty of rearing the human family, ought to be excluded from factory work by every Christian legislation, or ought, at least, to be effectually guaranteed against the abuses practised by manufacturers. Hertling, while he considers it extremely difficult to determine the duration of an average day's work for adults, yet believes that in order to avoid many and serious abuses, now of almost daily occurrence, it would suffice to fix a maximum limit not to be exceeded.

Doctor George Ratzinger, while considering the actual system of industrial organisation as most unjust, and admitting that the workman's condition is daily growing more insecure and unendurable, does not, however, reach the consequences maintained by Hitze. He admits that the struggle between labour and capital does really proceed from the contrast existing between the principles we profess and the position which we force upon the workman; he clearly perceives the evils of economic liberalism, attributing to it a large share

[1] *Vide ut supra, L'association catholique.*

of our present troubles, yet does not think there can be any safe way out of the dilemma, unless by the adoption of the compulsory guilds. The conflict between the working-classes and capitalists, that bitter warfare which threatens the very foundations of our social life, and presents the greatest danger for the future, may, according to Ratzinger, be calmed down not only by a Christian social organisation and just industrial reforms, but also, and principally, by a system of Christian employment of labour similar to those founded, with such large and generous views, by several industrialists of the North of France.[1]

Dr. Ratzinger further proposes that in order to help the landed proprietors, and more especially the small holders, who, for want of capital, can only cultivate their land under great difficulties, the State and each province should have the land valued, and issue a special paper currency on these lands, to the amount of half their value, by which means the Government could advance loans of money to the agriculturists. These loans should be gratuitous, without interest, only obliging the debtors to pay two and a half per cent. yearly, during a period of twenty-eight years, to redeem the capital furnished them.

This, however, is not a socialistic, but an anti-socialistic measure. In fine, the contributors to the loan, *i.e.*, the great mass of the nation, are to make a gift to the landowners.[2]

The German Catholic Socialists, to a large extent, rich landowners, have not, it is clear, the lofty disinterestedness of Von Ketteler, but only too often conceal their private class-interests under the appearance of a social reform, made not for the benefit of those who are low down, but for the benefit of those who are high up.

[1] *Vide* Ratzinger, *Die Volkswirthschaft in ihren sittlichen Grundlagen*, pp. 201 and following, 389 and following. Herder: Freiburg, 1881.

[2] Ratzinger, works already quoted, pp. 345-346. See also other important works by Ratzinger, *Geschichte der Kirchlichen Armenpflege*, p. 611; Herder: Freiburg, 1884. See further on Ratzinger's ideas, Wermert, *Neuere social-politische Anschauungen*, etc., chap. ii. Compare, also, January number, 1884, of the *Church Quarterly Review*.

The young Count Lösewitz, who afterwards became converted to Catholicism, dedicated himself with much ardour to the study of the social question. He is a most convinced supporter of the corporative or guild system, and an *ultra* defender of the scheme for an energetic regulation of labour; in several remarkable articles published in France in the *Association Catholique*, and which raised a long series of discussions and polemics, he anticipated even Flürsheim in accepting a large portion of the conclusions arrived at by the Collectivist school. However, though the theories he advanced show a vast acquaintance with the progress made by the laws of social economy, expressed with much ability and erudition, they seemed so very bold and dangerous that Count de Mun judged it necessary to decline any responsibility regarding them, and to qualify them in a conservative sense.[1]

Lösewitz, like the socialists of all the other schools, considers the workman's present position harder to bear and more uncertain than it has ever been. "People particularly insist," he writes, "on the fact that slavery, which was one of the fundamental institutions of ancient civilisation, no longer exists in our modern society, as also on this other fact, no less important, that productive labour, formerly so dishonoured and despised, is recognised at the present day as the basis of all economic order. And, indeed, a profound change, as

[1] Among the very remarkable articles published by Lösewitz in the *Association Catholique*, note the following: "Les principes de l'ordre social-chrétien et les doctrines économiques des temps modernes," vol. xx., p. 233; studies on the "Législation du travail," vol. xix., pp. 132, 257, 515, vol. xx., pp. 28, 273, and 405, vol. xxi., pp. 1 and 125; and on the "Législation du travail du point de vue de l'industrie nationale," vol. xvi., pp. 289 and 419, vol. xvii., pp. 5, 314, and 747, vol. xviii., pp. 16 and 137; "Les principes généraux du droit industriel," vol. xix., p. 132; "Les lois sur les fabriques et la réglementation de la petite industrie," vol. xix., p. 257; "Les mesures législatives tendant à prévenir les excès du travail," vol. xix., p. 615; "Le travail des enfants et des jeunes ouvriers," vol. xx., p. 28; "Le travail des femmes," vol. xx., p. 273. Count de Mun made several restrictions on Lösewitz's programme in his letter on the "Legislation for Labour," also published in the *Association Catholique*, vol. xxi., p. 241.

regards all this, has been realised under the influence of Christianity. But we seem to forget that for several centuries back the Christian social order has ceased to exist, and that the principles of paganism, upon which slavery and an abnormal condition of labour were founded, now effectually govern the public life of modern society. Thus labour is fully as despised and proscribed in our day as ever it was in ancient pagan society; and slavery does very often exist in actual reality on account of the absolute dependence in which labour stands with regard to capital. The Liberal school, always most willing to be satisfied with words and phrases without the slightest attention to the real truth of things, prefers not taking this state of matters into consideration; but any one who has had the opportunity of sounding the abyss of physical and moral misery, the state of utter brutishness to which modern society abandons its proletarian classes, will easily be convinced that, to use the words of a profound thinker, slavery in its worst forms was less cruel, less inhuman, and consequently less anti-Christian (since Christianity means true humanity), than this state of proscription, of neglect, of abandonment, in which lies steeped the immense majority of the population of those nations which we consider the most civilised. Careful observers must also feel convinced that, in so-called Christian and civilised Europe, the civilisation of the few demands as a necessary condition of its existence the bondage of the great majority of the population, and that the present condition of the working-classes more closely resembles the slavery of ancient pagan times than the serfdom of the middle ages. Though the Liberal school always speaks of the freedom of labour, no such thing as freedom of labour or choice of a residence exists for the workman; unless he wish to die of starvation, he and his family are bound down to some determined locality and occupation. He must work for the rich manufacturer, and this necessity is quite as absolute for him as it would be for a slave toiling in fetters beneath the lash. In the face of this, the real state of things, what then can signify the juridical liberty which modern society grants to the workman? That

terrible and most imperious need they stand in of finding an employer binds them to the cruellest subjection. Very often the relations between masters and workmen do not even pretend to maintain the appearance of a free contract in which the conditions are stipulated with the complete agreement of both sides, an appearance of which the Liberal school avails itself to dissimulate under high-sounding phrases the odious nature of the slavery to which hired labour is subjected, under systems which have lost all vestige of Christian justice. The Church had striven unceasingly to procure real liberty for the serfs, by transforming more and more, according to the spirit of Christianity, the nature of the reciprocal ties that bound them to their masters. She had never dreamt of destroying these relations, or of creating a wretched proletarian population, free in name, but, in reality, abandoned to the mercy of the rich. Liberalism has proceeded differently. The humanitarian principle, that is to say, the interests of capitalistic production, which constantly demands the abolition of slavery, had urged even the capitalists of ancient Rome to free their slaves, as being the best means of furthering their own interests. The present social condition is not, therefore, so very different in this respect from that of ancient society, though some may wish to believe it so."

Rationalistic sociology, in denying the final causes of things, comes to admit of no other right but that of strength, and naturally leads to anarchical principles.

Thus, beside the daily weakening of faith among the working-classes, we have the constant economic difficulties which render the existing social inequalities more and more dangerous and unbearable.[1]

The Catholic party is destined to exercise a preponderating action on coming events, if only it is able to avoid becoming the accomplice of that false civilisation which imagines it can remedy so many crying injustices by private or official philanthropy.[2]

[1] See Lösewitz's article in *Le Contemporain*, 1st July, 1881.

[2] Compare *L'association catholique, revue des questions sociales*, etc., p. 253 and following; 15th August, 1885.

Now, it is not enough that the teachings and examples of Christ be the foundation to our private and public life. We must strive to restore to our public and social institutions their former Christian character, raising up on the ruins of our present pagan legislation, another and better, which, like that of Charlemagne, may merit to be called the faithful follower of canon law, *Canonum pedisequa.*

The apparent prosperity of modern society hides social ills ready to burst out, and the only remedy must come from a profound social regeneration.

Liberal economy has but words and useless remedies to oppose to the evils of our social system, and considers it sufficient to recommend the foundation of philanthropic and co-operative societies, savings banks, the vain principle of "self-help," and personal initiative.

The brutal instincts of hatred and destruction, the violent expression of which blinds the economists and leads them to deny the existence of the social question, are not the cause, but the results, of a vicious system of social organisation, which threatens to end in decomposition. The social question in Europe and the agrarian question in Ireland are but phases of this general decomposition.

Free labour, the fruit of Liberal theories, has removed every obstacle that could place a limitation on the productiveness or the accumulative power of capital. The system of electoral right, which is almost everywhere the privilege of wealth, has given over all political power into the hands of the capitalists, who would have all to consider that the State is bound to guarantee to them the right of speculating freely and with impunity upon the masses. As, therefore, justice and a Christian conscience form a permanent obstacle to these theories, the State is specially charged to suffocate them by means of public instruction; thus only can we explain the apparent contradiction in Liberalism, which, while it repudiates all State interference in economic matters, invokes it in the sphere of intellectual life, in order that the rising generations may become less and less capable of perceiving that free labour means, neither more nor less, than free brigandage. Hence

the great success of the Jews, the "kings of the period," according to Toussenel, who are, at one and the same time, plutocrats and anti-Christian.

There cannot be the slightest doubt that modern society is bound to undergo a radical change.

The economic system which the Catholics demand must have for basis the re-establishment of justice, which is nothing else than the observance of social order, such as God wills and ordains it. Upon justice alone rests the true balance of all human power, and of that "peace among men" which is founded upon peace between God and man.

The Liberal school, with Adam Smith and the physiocrats, reduce all economic science to the observance of those laws which they allege naturally preside over the production, exchange, and distribution of wealth; in other words, they reduce one of the most important branches of science to the mere study of constantly recurring phenomena. The liberty thus allowed to economic factors would, in reality, be nothing better than that capacity they possess of following certain laws imposed on them by an irresistible force, much the same as the liberty of the stone which obeys the law of gravitation as soon as the contrary impulse communicated to it by the hand of man ceases.

The final scope of social economy is, consequently, according to such doctrines, the mere satisfaction of material wants, the better to satisfy which it becomes necessary to develop with unceasing activity the increase of production; in other words, the combined action of capital and labour brought to bear upon Nature, and which becomes all the more powerful because of the free play of economic forces.

Naturalistic doctrine brought to bear upon economic matters is hence false and iniquitous; and by not admitting of any artificial legal system, and considering wages only as a ware, subject to the laws of supply and demand, it becomes an essentially pagan conception, leading to the negation of all human liberty. Now, the economists of the materialistic school do not perceive the profound difference existing between considerations of a physical and those of a moral order.

According to their theories social life ought to be governed by the law of force, not by that of justice.

The production and distribution of riches are to the social organism what nutrition is to animal organisms, any perturbation, atrophy, or hypertrophy of the members being fully as dangerous to the one as to the other.

The absence of all regulating power must necessarily lead to the destruction of social equilibrium.

Man is bound to impose on himself certain restrictions which neither God nor Nature laid on him, hence the necessity of those laws which lead him towards justice, not by liberty but by social order. Consequently, the public powers have a far higher mission to accomplish than the mere protection of individuals and their private rights; they are called upon to second individuals in the fulfilling of their common destiny: "the *laissez-faire, laissez-aller* system in politics is thoroughly anti-social".

The State should direct the social forces into one current of tendencies, instead of absorbing them, the better to substitute itself in their place, which is what is happening in those modern States where all social force has ceased to exist, giving place solely to individual forces.

Although public power reigns supreme over society as over each individual, yet its authority is by no means absolute. It does not create those rights which it is bound to see respected, nor those eternal principles it is bound to support. The social interests of which it is the constituted guardian can only exist through the re-establishment of the kingdom of Christ upon earth, by striving to assimilate human society to its Divine prototype. On the contrary, individual interest is the very source of evil. Thus, while Christian Socialism has every right to exist, Individualism is always an iniquity.

The profound change which has taken place in the labour system is due in far greater degree to the new theories introduced into our public institutions, than to the great modern inventions.

Nations, like individuals, are masters of their own destinies. No nations are doomed to irreparable decay: *Sanabiles fecit*

nationes orbis terrarum. The public institutions they adopt are the principal agents of their rise or fall. The State powers ought to exercise a certain action, and have a social policy. Experience and the study of history led the economic school of the so-called theoretic socialists to admit that the State, while protecting the rights of property, is likewise bound to protect those of labour; but the doctors of the Catholic Church have always proclaimed this as a fundamental truth. And it is only the baneful influence of Liberal ideas that has induced some persons, who declare themselves attached to the Church, to accept the principle of the non-intervention of the State, which is clearly in opposition to the teachings of the Church.

The influence exercised by Roman law on mediæval legislation, and particularly in Germany, has been most disastrous. Roman civilisation was founded solely upon conquest and egoism; the Roman right of property, the *jus utendi et abutendi*, leads to most destructive consequences. Its economic system was founded on capital, not on lab ur, and the price of goods was not regulated by the objective value of the articles, but by simple agreement concluded between the interested parties. Hence no objective equity could exist.[1]

In spite of his legal liberty, the workman in modern society is no less held in subjection than were the slaves in ancient times. The absolute necessity in which he stands of finding employment exercises over him a restriction no less grievous than were the threats of whip and chains. Those capitalists of pagan Rome who best understood their own interests gave their slaves liberty; modern Liberalism has acted precisely in the same manner, and with its *humanitarian* principle has merely replaced the serfs by proletarians, who, though free in name, are in reality at the tender mercies of the rich.

The origin of the decomposition of Roman civilisation may safely be traced to that species of worship in which wealth was

[1] This the usual play upon words employed by socialist writers. What do they mean by objective value? Besides, is it possible that, given any form of social organisation, the price of an article is not based on its utility or rarity, but on the amount of effort expended in its production?

held, and the small number of capitalists (two thousand to a population of a million and a half), the formation of a numerous class of proletarians, and the violent class antagonism that existed. And now that modern nations are solely dominated, as Adam Smith says, by the spirit of traffic, these alarming symptoms have reappeared. Thus alone can we account for the twofold fact, that the so-called natural law of modern times is nothing else than Roman law stripped of those peculiarities which had their reason for existing in certain circumstances proper to Roman society, and that the so-called natural laws of Liberal economy may all, without exception, be found among the Pandects.

This aversion to Roman law is common to all the Catholic writers of Germany, who, generally speaking, attribute the evils of our present economic legislation to the deleterious influence of the jurists of the middle ages.[1]

Having already mentioned Baron Von Hertling, who, owing to his high social position, has much influence among German Catholics, we should now turn our attention to Jäger and Jörg, but these two Catholic historians of Socialism derive their views more or less from Monsignor Ketteler and Hitze, whose influence is evidently manifest throughout all their works.[2]

[1] Compare Jannet, *Le Socialisme d'État*, chap. ii., § 5; Schrœder, *Rechtsgeschichte*, § 63; Luschin Von Ebengreuth, *Geschichte des ältern Gerichtswesens*, pp. 159-172; Maurer, *Geschichte des Gerichtsverfarhens*, pp. 107, 239-289; Stintzing, *Geschichte der deutschen Rechtswissenschaft*, vol. i., p. 3 and following; G. Blondel, "Les classes rurales en Allemagne au moyen âge," in the *Réforme Sociale*, November, 1891.

[2] See Hertling, *Aussätze und Reden.* Jäger has written some important works on the history and tendencies of Socialism. See Dr. E. Jäger, *Geschichte des Socialen Bewegung und des Socialismus in Frankreich*, Berlin, 1876; *Der Moderne Socialismus*, Berlin, 1873; E. Jörg, *Geschichte der Socialpolitischen Parteien in Deutschland*, Freiburg, 1867, etc. Hertling, one of the leaders of the Catholic Social party in the Reichstag, is a relative of Savigny, and on his death, in 1875, replaced him in the Reichstag. Baron Von Hertling is professor of the University of Munich, and was named vice-president of the Reichstag, in place of Baron Von Frankenstein. He is an eloquent and attractive speaker, and is highly esteemed by his colleagues. See the article by Viscount H. Begouen, "Le parti catholique en Allemagne," in the *Correspondant*, p. 31, 10th April, 1887.

Nor must we forget to notice among the Catholic writers who support the most daring social theories, and are leaders of the German Catholic Socialist party, Abbé Schings, Albertus, Hohenberg, etc., who, though they may often be found wanting in originality, yet bring such an amount of keen observation, such bold theories, to bear on the study of social phenomena as would be difficult to find among the Catholic writers of other countries.

Nor have the members of the Alsatian clergy remained indifferent before this invasion of Socialism. However, as they are, for the most part, French prelates, devoted to their former country, and were incorporated with Germany just before that Government began its anti-Catholic policy, they have always shown that they have but small faith in State intervention; nevertheless, they fully accept the theories of the German Catholic clergy. Their attitude, as is evident, is due to political, rather than to economic, or social causes.

In Alsace, which, owing to its economic constitution, great agricultural wealth, and, above all, the intense political passions by which it is agitated, might have been expected to remain free from all social complications, Socialism at first filtered in but slowly, then suddenly took a most rapid development. Imported by Swiss and German workmen, it barely won four hundred and sixty-two votes at the elections in 1881,[1] but at the last elections it became evident that the socialists had gained ground everywhere; Bebel was very near winning at Strasburg, and a Social Democrat was returned by a large majority at Mülhausen, in preference to the ex-deputy, Abbé Keller, an ardent Frenchman and Liberal.

Among the many Alsatian prelates, two in particular, Keller and Winterer, have applied themselves seriously to the study of the social question. Keller, who was not returned at the last elections, and, much to the disgust of the "protesting party," was replaced by a Social Democratic, has always maintained theories the reverse of radical on economic questions, whether in discussing them in the Reichstag, or with

[1] Abbé Winterer, *Le danger social, ou deux années de socialisme en Europe et en Amerique*, p. 15. Paris: Poussielgue, 1885.

other German Economists. Francophil in his sympathies, he was, so long as he sat in the Reichstag, a constant opposer of the compulsory insurance system, and of all other interference of the State in the relations between capitalists and workmen.[1]

On the other hand, Winterer, the author of some very remarkable studies on Socialism and its history, has shown that his views on the subject are much larger and more original than those held by Keller. Winterer does not attempt to deny the existence of a social question, which must be solved if we would avoid some immense catastrophe. To this end "State intervention is necessary and indispensable.[2] I wish to affirm this as strongly as possible; the baneful laws of the past have contributed to social evils; this is a primary motive why the State is bound to interfere."[3] But the action of the State, introduced too late, is insufficient, since Socialism is not an economic evil alone; the State must create laws to protect the working-class. However, the compulsory insurance system is insufficient; a sick workman is relieved only during three months, and one meets unoccupied workmen on all the highways that lead to the great industrial centres. The State cannot do everything; though its sphere of action is vast, yet it has certain limits. The Church has also a social action to accomplish, and, by means of her bishops, has boldly faced the social question. Every priest is bound to attend not only to the care of souls, but also to the material well-being of his people.

In his speech before the Reichstag, 19th May, 1890, in treating of the new social laws presented by the emperor[4]

[1] "It is neither Catholic nor French," he said, in the closing speech of the Catholic General Assembly, held at Paris, in 1888. See *La Réforme Sociale*, No. 16.

[2] Winterer, *Le Socialisme Contemporain*, Paris, Palmé, 1879; *Trois années de l'histoire du socialisme en Europe et en Amérique*, Paris, Poussielgue, 1885; *Le socialisme international, coup d'œil sur le mouvement socialiste de* 1885-1890, Paris, Lecoffre, 1890.

[3] *Discours prononcé par M. l'Abbé Winterer au congrès social de Liège, le 6 Septembre*, 1887, p. 12. Rixheim: Sutter, 1887.

[4] Reproduced in *Le Lorrain*, of Metz, 23rd May, and in the *Association Catholique, revue mensuelle des questions sociales et ouvrières*, pp. 735-

after the international congress held at Berlin, Abbé Winterer made a very open declaration of his views and programme.

"If," he said, "the Catholics have been forced to oppose the last projects on compulsory insurance pushed beyond all just bounds, yet they have ever been favourable to any just and equitable measures tending to protect labour. We maintain the principle that, labour being the weaker side and capital the stronger, the State has not only the right, but the obligation, to protect the rights of the weak every time such a course may become necessary."

The labour movement must not be confounded with the socialist movement; the close of the last century was marked by the struggle for the claims of the third estate, the close of the present century must face a similar struggle for those of the fourth estate. So long as these demands are just we are bound to second them, and the protection of labour must be international; as the labour movement and the alliance between the various socialist parties is international, as well as the situation created by capitalistic production, so also must the measures adopted in defence of the working-class have an international character. The obligation of rest on Sundays, and the prohibition of all night work for women and children must be assured, and we cannot but deplore that the Berlin Congress did not also fix the maximum working day for adults, since Switzerland and Austria have already set us the example. There is no use in saying that the adult workman stands less in need of protection than women and children; either he must be guaranteed by the law, or he is obliged to have recourse to strikes. "Between strikes which throw whole provinces into a state of agitation, and which constitute, as it were, so many stages further down on the

740, 15th June, 1890. See also the address delivered by the Abbé Winterer at the University of Louvain, on the "Péril Social," in the *Revue Générale*, January, 1892. Is it not extraordinary that so intelligent a person should make use of expressions so decidedly vulgar as some of those which garnish this last speech? "Marx was the person best fitted to judge of his own work, on which he impressed the seal of Satan," p. 39. Are not similar trivialities unworthy of a serious writer?

highway of social hatred, and a proper regulation enforced by law, my choice is soon made: 'I vote in favour of legal regulation'."

Hartmann's scheme, as all schemes for the protection of the employers, is unjust. If we are not to separate the interests of the employer from those of his workmen, if strikes alone are not the ideal to be attained, if such as provoke strikes by means of base suggestions ought to be punished, yet it were not well quite to forget that, under the present wage system, the right of coalition is often the workman's sole defensive arm. So long as this merciless system of competition is to have the decision of the amount of wages to be paid, so long as the workman's means of sustenance depend on this blind and hurtful rivalry, no obstacle should be offered to the right of coalition.

"It has been attempted," said Winterer, in speaking at the last Congress held at Liége, "to reduce the social question to a purely economic question, a mere question of supply and demand; yet we must remember that, according to the Word of God, man liveth not by bread alone. Man has been forced into the service of machinery, and in the name of humanity we must invert the parts and place machinery at the service of man. The workman is considered as a mere instrument, a factor in the problem of production; we must remember that he is a father, that the working-woman is a mother. Money has insensibly been allowed to become the greatest power in the world; we must deliver humanity from this subjection, which is at once humiliating, fatal and heartless. Capital is allowed to govern men individually, producing a hitherto unheard-of multitude of proletarians, the mere thought of whom terrifies us, and who form a far vaster army than those already so numerous of modern nations. We must make every effort in our power to stay, or at least oppose, this fatal tide of indefinite proletarisation."[1]

But not all the Alsatian clergy show the same daring and tendencies as Winterer. They are in general too much preoccupied by the question of nationality, and, living in a

[1] See *Gazette de Liége*, 9th September, 1890.

country where socialistic ideas penetrated but recently, they study the social question much less than the Catholic clergy of the rest of Germany.

"In the conflict of material and economic interests," said the Catholic party in the programme they presented to their electors before the general elections, 1884, "we will support the weak against the strong, striving to act with compensating justice, so as to satisfy both great and small interests, placing all considerations of a moral order before those merely relating to material interests. With a view to this we shall ask for the autonomic and corporative organisation of the various craft guilds; nor do we consider it by any means impossible to adapt such an organisation to the requirements of trade and modern progress." [2]

Since the first bold step due to the initiative of Monsignor Ketteler, the Catholics have never omitted to appoint a special section at their annual congresses, charged to examine from a Christian standpoint all the more important features of the social question.

After the Haid programme grave dissensions arose among the Catholic Socialists; the division became still more accentuated at the successive congresses, and at Frankfort, in 1882, the Catholic delegates of North Germany were unable to come to an understanding with those sent from other parts of the empire.

At the thirty-first General Assembly, held at Amberg, in 1884, the Social Studies Section, under the presidency of Prince Löwenstein, presented an ample report on the three important questions: Usury, the easing of the burdens on landed property, and wages.

While admitting the principle of lending at interest, the Amberg Committee recognised that the abuse made of it in modern society is unjustifiable and injurious.

[1] On the social action of the clergy in Alsace-Lorraine, see Jannet, *Le Socialisme d'État*, pp. 164 and 299; the article, "Les Associations Catholiques en Suisse et en Allemagne," in the *Association Catholique*, vol. xxvii., p. 599.

[2] See the *Association Catholique*, p. 492, 15th October, 1884.

"The disastrous tyranny," says the report drawn up by the commission, "now exercised by capital in all economic spheres, can only be checked by a radical re-organisation of social relations, carried out on a just and moral basis, and in accordance with natural law and the teachings of Christianity." Considering the disorder which actually exists, the most opportune means for weakening such tyranny are: (*a*) To return to legislative provisions which will establish a maximum rate of interest for the different kinds of operations in credit; (*b*) to regulate the supervision of all transactions in discount on gold and bills of exchange, principally with a view to prevent fraudulent speculations, speculation on the fall of stock, etc.; (*c*) to apply severe punishment to all forms of usury, not only in cases where, profiting by the ignorance or necessity of the debtor, an exorbitant interest has been asked, but each time that the legal maximum rate has been exceeded, and more especially when this system is practised as a profession.

The Amberg Committee recognised the necessity of introducing a Christian legislation for labour which would assure to the workman a legal limitation of the maximum duration of a day's work, according to the various ages and branches of industry, the severest possible restrictions of work on Sundays and night-work, a prohibition of the employment of married women in factories. According to the Catholics met together at Amberg, social legislation and corporative organisations ought "to consider as their principal aim the introduction of a proper equilibrium and stability in production and consumption".[1]

Thus was it that the Catholic Socialists of Germany, who, in Monsignor Von Ketteler's time, showed that they placed much more faith in the social action of the Church than in State intervention, have gradually come nearer and nearer to the theories and programme of the State Socialists.

Let us now examine what has been, and still is, the attitude maintained by the Catholic German Socialists with regard to the State Socialists and the programme of social reforms undertaken by the German Government.

[1] See the *Association Catholique*, p. 750, 15th December, 1884.

The Catholic writers and economists who, during and since the *Kulturkampf* struggle, have given their attention to the social question, were placed in a very trying position. To hope much from private initiative, even after Monsignor Von Ketteler had, in his last years, come to consider it necessary to have recourse to the State, would, indeed, have seemed a vain illusion; while, on the other hand, to have completely depended on the action of Government just at a time when the Church was enduring the gravest persecutions at the hands of the State, would have been equivalent to neglecting Catholic interests.[1]

It is for this reason that, during the first period, that is to say, from the publication of Monsignor Von Ketteler's works up to the beginning of the struggle against *Kulturkampf*, the Catholic Socialists expound economic theories and projects for reform, whereas in the second period they principally try to group the Catholic workmen into labour societies, having the double scope of defending the interests of the Church, and of co-operating to obtain an improvement in the condition of the working-class.

It is, however, quite evident that the doctrines held by the Catholic Socialists spring for the most part from those of the State Socialists, and that both parties, though starting from different points, and having somewhat dissimilar ends in view, yet fully mean to reach those ends by the same path.

The corporative system advocated by almost all the Catholic Socialists and Social Catholics in Germany, and which, since ten years, forms the programme of the French Catholic Socialists, is likewise the starting-point of the State Socialists.[2] And whoever studies the scheme of reforms pro-

[1] Regarding the struggles between Church and State in Germany and the difficulties encountered by the clergy, see the *Revue Catholique* of Louvain, p. 517, October, 1871; Abbé T. Cornel, *Chronique religieuse de l'Allemagne jusqu'à la fin d'Oct.*, 1871; and, more particularly, Bachem, *Preuszen und die Katholische Kirche*, p. 120, 3rd edition, Cologne, Bachem, 1884.

[2] But Rodbertus Jagetzow, the most famous supporter of State Socialism, had but small faith in the social efficacy of the Catholic Church. In the *Christlich-Sociale Blätter*, 1889, p. 2172, are to be found

posed by Hitze, will at once perceive that it does not much differ from that of the State Socialists, and that both sides present many essential affinities.[1]

According to the State Socialists, all employers and workmen ought to be grouped into corporations. No one should be allowed to exercise a trade unless belonging to the corresponding guild, nor be admitted to a corporation previous to having undergone an examination to test his capacity; the admissions should never exceed the limits of number fixed by each body. The great industrial establishments should form themselves into district or national corporations, and all the guilds of the same trade, existing in different cities of a nation, ought to unite so as to form national federations.[2]

And many State Socialists do not stop here. They would have the State to regulate not only production, but even population; they maintain that legislation, besides placing a restriction on freedom in choice of residence, prohibiting all emigration from the rural districts and the rapid population of the large cities, should also put a check on marriage among proletarians.[3]

many interesting particulars on the project for State Socialism presented to Bismarck in 1869 by Rodbertus Jagetzow and Hermann Wagner, just before the famous *Kulturkampf* struggle began, and in this the Catholic Church held but a very secondary position.

[1] Schäffle's new programme has been very clearly exposed by Burkheim in the *Journal des économistes*, January, 1888. Among the most remarkable schemes for State Socialism recently published, may be noted: Hermann Bucher, *Die Nährstände und ihre zukunftige Stellung in Staate*, 1885, Berlin; and W. Stieda in *Hillebrand's Jahrbücher für Nationalœkonomie*, vol. ii., 14th year, Jena, 1876.

[2] See Winkelblech (Marlo), *Untersuchungen über die Organisation der Arbeit, oder System der Weltœkonomie*, vol. ii., pp. 314-315, 2nd edition, Tübingen, 1886; Adolph Wagner, *Allgemeine Volkswirthschaftslehre*, vol. i., p. 378, 1876; Schäffle, *Kapitalismus und Socialismus*; Schönberg, *Arbeitsämter, eine Aufgabe des deutschen Reichs*, Berlin, 1891, etc. See further the records of the numerous congresses of the *Verein für Socialpolitik*.

[3] See, among many others, H. Sötbeer, *Die Stellung der Sozialisten zur Malthusschen Bevölkerungslehre*, Göttingen, 1886. In England, Karl Pearson supports similar views, *The Ethic of Free Thought*, London, 1888.

Now, if the Catholics often admit the necessity of regulating production, they cannot, however, whatever may be their economic theories, accept these other ideas. The *Freie Vereinigung der katholischen socialen Politiker*, met together at Mayence, 15th August, 1887, after having proposed several theses that logically tended to the limitation of marriage among proletarians, and having blamed the too frequent disposition among working people to marry on insufficient means, was obliged to limit itself to these platonic affirmations, and declare its inability to proceed further, as the Church alone has indefeasible rights in the matter of marriage legislation.[1]

Besides, there exists in the Catholic Social party a strong current which, while it repudiates economic Liberalism, yet shows but small faith in the efficacy of a re-establishment of the corporative system, and views with mistrust the growth and extension of any preponderating action on the part of the State. This current, led by Abbé Schings, the director of the *Christlich-Sociale Blätter*, fears that if the re-establishment of the compulsory corporations be admitted, Catholics may be placed at a disadvantage with regard to Protestants, and that the actual bureaucratic system, called upon to apply the reforms advocated by State Socialism, may be fatal to the interests and future of Catholicism.[2]

"The old corporations," writes Schings, "were created by the Church. And it was because they were religious associations, and maintained their character as such, that they preserved their vigour and stability. . . . The Christian spirit was as a family tie, uniting together masters, fellow-workmen, and apprentices, and the destruction of this spirit by the Renaissance and the Reformation was the death-blow to the corporations. How, then, can these new compulsory corporations, which must necessarily comprise all workmen, without any distinction of creed,—how, then, can they be expected to produce the same beneficial results? How can you

[1] See Jannet, *Le Socialism d'État*, p. 158.

[2] Confront the articles "Die Bureaukratische Social Reforme" and "Die confessionelle Hetze und die Social Demokratie," in the *Christlich-Sociale Blätter*, November and December, 1889.

expect to find this family spirit in a workshop where the master is a Protestant, the foreman a Jew, the apprentice a Catholic, or *vice versâ?* A guild composed of Catholics and Protestants could have no real consistence, and would merely have an external appearance of union, maintained, perhaps, by the police. But if the policeman's baton can make a man stagger, it cannot make water spring from the living rock, as did the rod of Moses." On the other hand, "the policeman's baton is already but too powerful in the German empire, and the number of citizens who live under the State rod is very great". Let the workmen beware lest they "sacrifice on the altar of the God-State what yet remains to them of civil liberty". When under the State's supreme direction Catholic and Protestant workmen will be united into compulsory guilds, religious indifference and Protestantism will make rapid progress under the ægis of *Equality of Creeds*, which is the constitutional principle of Prussia. Windthorst had good reason to say, in addressing the Catholic Assembly at Münster: "If we do not go to the length of the compulsory guilds, it is because we Catholics would become servants, and the Protestants masters. . . ."[1]

Since the Congress of Fulda, almost all the Catholic German clergy have interested themselves more or less in the social question; the greater number of them accept, with several reserves due to the spirit of Catholicism, the ideas held by the State Socialists; the other side, without accepting the theories of the Liberal school, yet view rather suspiciously the growth of the all-invading action of the Government. Even the higher members of the clergy admit that a great part of the demands of the working-class is just, and that much ought to be done with a view to re-establish, at least partially, a social economic system more conformable to Christian principles.

The Catholic social movement, so widely extended in Germany, has gradually drawn all the religious orders to join

[1] See the *Christlich-Sociale Blätter*, Oct., 1888. Compare, also, with the article of Claude Jannet, "Les faits économiques et le mouvement social," in the *Correspondant*, p. 345, 25th January, 1887.

it. Even the Jesuits, in their leading review, *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, have not only adopted the views of the State Socialists, but in many cases anticipated them. Father Lehmkuhl, who has applied himself to social studies with no small acumen, holds that the State ought not only to regulate the duration of a day's labour, but in those countries[1] "where free contract between masters and men leads to the oppression of the workman, or even to the danger of his being oppressed, by his employer, public authority may and ought, according to circumstances, to fix a minimum wage, and see to its application. . . . And, indeed, it would seem, under the present circumstances, that the direct and indirect regulation of wages imposes itself on public authority as a duty."[2]

None of the Catholic party have any longer the slightest illusion that any solid reform can be effected without State intervention. Even those bishops who, during the struggle between Church and State which took place in Germany, underwent arrest, sentences, and persecutions, now turn their eyes imploringly towards the State, without whose intervention they consider that all attempts at reform will be vain.

Monsignor Korum, Bishop of Trèves, after having in a most eloquent speech at the Congress at Liége told of the persecutions endured, and related all that the clergy have done in Germany to contribute to the good of the working-classes, openly affirms that they must act even more boldly than they have hitherto done, but that whatever action they exercise will be inefficacious without the support of the State.

At the Berlin Congress, the radical memorial presented by the French mechanic Delahaye, and inserted *in extenso* in the

[1] See the article on the "Obligation to Insure" and "Compulsory Insurance" in the *Stimmen aus Maria, Laach*, August, 1889. See also Lehmkuhl's letter to the Freiburg Union, reproduced in the memorial, *Sur la réglementation et la durée du travail*, presented at the last congress held at Liége. At the same congress Father Lehmkuhl presented an important memorial, *De la légitimité et de l'illégitimité des grèves*, supporting his right to strike as the only guarantee left to the workman under the existing organisation of labour.

[2] See Lehmkuhl's letter to the Freiburg Union as quoted above.

record of the deliberations, was received with favour, or, to say the least, with good-will by His Grace Monsignor Kopp, Archbishop of Breslau, who had been sent as delegate by the Emperor of Germany.[1] "A most significant fact," as the *Association Catholique* very justly remarks.[2]

Up to the present the Catholic Centre party has been the real arbiter of the Parliamentary situation in Germany, since on the division of the Reichstag, the victory of the Conservatives or of the National Liberals depends on the decision of its vote.

But it is true that Von Windthorst, who, up to the time of his death, was the leader of the Catholic party, gave much more of his attention to political questions than to the social question. Though a powerful orator and indefatigable agitator, he was wanting in the economic knowledge and calmness of judgment so necessary in one who treats this all-important question.[3]

However, intelligent ecclesiastics, like the Abbé Hitze, etc., have never ceased from demanding from the Reichstag serious legislation in favour of the working-class, and still dedicate all their powers to this most noble end.

The German Catholic Centre, though devoted to the Vatican, and most persevering in the defence of the interests of the Church, has always shown itself independent in its political and social conduct. Several years ago, Baron Von Franckenstein, a member of the Centre, and at that time Vice-President of the Reichstag, in writing to the papal nuncio, says: "I need not tell you that the Centre has always been most happy to execute the orders of the Holy See whenever there was any question of ecclesiastical laws, but I already took the liberty of writing, in 1880, that it was absolutely

[1] See the records of the Berlin Congress in the Italian *Green Book*, p. 140.

[2] See the number of the 15th May, 1890, p. 542.

[3] Compare the apologetic biography of Von Windthorst by Kannengieser, *Catholiques Allemands*, pp. 1-48; compare, in a contrary sense, Paul Vasili, *La Société de Berlin*, chap. x., 23rd edition; *M. de Windthorst et les Catholiques*, pp. 100-118, Paris, 1884.

impossible for the Centre to obey orders given regarding laws that were not of an ecclesiastical nature. My opinion is that it would be prejudicial to the Centre, and a source of very serious annoyance to the Holy See, were the Centre party to ask for instructions from the Holy Father in regard to laws which in no way affect the rights of the Church."[1] German Catholics have adopted a very happy way of expressing it. In religious questions they say: "First Catholics and then Germans;" but in political questions: "First Germans and then Catholics".

The Catholic Centre is at fault and incoherent in almost always opposing the compulsory insurance system. "When," said Abbé Winterer at the Reichstag, in the sitting of the 4th April, 1889,[2] "more than thirteen millions of men will possess a recognised right to be supported by the State in their old age, or in case of inability to work, these adoptive children will not hesitate to turn to the father who thus feeds them and remind him of his duties, and very soon they will tell him that he who does not give enough to his children is not a good father. . . . The masses, counting upon the obligation of the State, will forget their obligations towards themselves and their families. Children, instead of providing for their aged parents, families, instead of caring for their old servants, will all turn to the State as the one great and principal guarantee. They will look upon the State as a species of universal Providence, but as the State will be unable to give all that they demand of it, antagonism, not peace, will end by dominating society. Then will the partisans of Social Democracy arise and cry: 'The State is universal Providence;' however, not the State as now constituted, but a Socialist State."

Nevertheless, though the Catholics, on account of their natural prejudice against it, feared all State intervention, they have gradually come to see the necessity for such interference.

After having supported several schemes for compulsory

[1] See the above-mentioned study by Begouen, p. 31.

[2] See Jannet, *Le Socialisme d'État*, p. 209.

insurance, and almost all those on social legislation, they are now following out, with much ardour, a programme which is in no way less daring than that of the State Socialists. An impartial observer, to whatever party he belongs, and whatever may be his ideas, will soon perceive that this concord among German Catholics on the subject of the social question is a fact of no small importance. The Catholics of Germany represent far more than a third of the whole population of the empire; they have one programme and one aim, and they are admirably disciplined. The divisions existing among the Parliamentary parties often render it easy for the Catholics of the Centre to become the real arbiters of the situation. If the Catholic economists, writers, and publicists but urge on their party on the path they are now treading, and have courage enough to draw the consequences of the principles they have so warmly proclaimed, there is no saying where they may stop, and it were even difficult to affirm that our forecasts may not be far surpassed.

CHAPTER VII.

THE GERMAN CATHOLIC SOCIALISTS AND THEIR SOCIAL ACTION.

The Catholic Socialist Propaganda—Newspapers and Reviews of the Catholic Socialist Party—Father Kolping and the *Gesellenvereine*—The Action of the Clergy—The *Arbeiter Vereine* and their Programme—The Catholic Labour Movement—The Catholic Industrialists and the *Arbeiterwohl*—The *Bauern-Vereine* in Westphalia and Baron Von Schorlemer-Alst—Baron Von Schorlemer-Alst's Social Views and Programme—Importance, Credit, and Diffusion of the *Bauern-Vereine* — The *Bauern-Vereine* of Catholic Germany—Their Action on the Agrarian Economy of the Country—The *Nassauischer Bauern-Vereine* — The Catholic Clergy and the Catholic Socialist Movement.

THE diffusion of the Catholic Socialist party in Germany is due to the propaganda carried on by its writers, the energetic action of the clergy, and, most of all, to its press and associations.

The German Catholic press is remarkably well organised, and counts among its collaborators many persons of merit and profound learning. Around the *Germania*, its principal organ, are grouped a number of political papers, social reviews, and small weekly papers, which are sufficiently well written, and not infrequently thoroughly competent in social matters. The *Arbeiterwohl*, conducted by Abbé Hitze; the *Historisch-Politische Blätter*, the *Christlich-Sociale Blätter*, under the direction of Abbé Schings, are all ably written reviews, in which the principal economic questions are boldly treated and with much erudition.[1]

[1] On Catholic journalism, and particularly on Catholic Socialist journalism in Germany, see the study by La Tour du Pin Chambly, "La question sociale chez les catholiques allemands," in the *Association Catholique*, vol. xx., p. 431; and Kannengieser, work already quoted, pp. 92-106.

In 1814 there existed in all Germany but one Catholic paper of any importance, the *Rheinische Merkur*, conducted by the celebrated Görres; there are now about four hundred and fifty, not a few of which are very largely read.

The *Presskaplan*, or journalist priest, is now a type very frequently met with in Germany.

In 1880 there existed in all the German empire:—

60 organs appearing six or seven times a week.
38 „ „ three „ „
42 „ „ twice „
46 „ „ once „

In 1890, instead, there were:—

94 organs appearing six or seven times a week.
48 „ „ three „ „
55 „ „ twice „
75 „ „ once „

German Catholic papers have greatly increased in number and importance,[1] and the active and energetic action of the press has been furthered by a large number of Catholic Socialist associations, all guided by one social programme, and bound together in the closest union.

A fact that cannot be denied is, that although the economic condition of the labouring classes is perhaps worse in the Catholic districts than elsewhere within the empire, Socialism has been very slow in spreading, and has encountered great difficulties. In the Rhine Provinces and in Westphalia, where the miners are mostly Catholics, as at Essen, Crefeld, Gladbach, Bochum, and Dortmund, the Social Democrats have met with insurmountable obstacles to the diffusion of their propaganda. Only at Cologne and Munich has economic discontent driven many workmen to enlist in the ranks of Social Democracy.

Of the thirty-six Socialist deputies in the Reichstag, twenty-five represent electoral colleges entirely composed of Protestants.

[1] These statistics are taken from the work by Kannengieser, *Catholiques Allemands*, p. 99, but as the author is very optimist it is well to accept his assertions with some reserve.

It is true that Cologne is one of the strongholds of Socialism, and throughout Bavaria, Von Vollmar enjoys large sympathies. But it should be remembered that he is neither an uncompromising authoritarian like Bebel, nor an exaggerated collectivist like Werner. Born of a noble Catholic family, and possessing a character all faith and enthusiasm, he had at one time devoted his sword to the service of the Church, as an officer in the papal army. Vollmar is an attractive public speaker, and a writer of much ability; he is gradually detaching himself from Bebel and Liebknecht, and has now but few ideas in common with most of his former companions. He is a thorough possibilist, and one of the calmest and most high-minded among German Socialists.[1]

Even before the Archbishop of Mayence had formulated from the pulpit of that cathedral the principles of Catholic Socialism to the anxious crowd, Father Kolping, who from being an humble shoemaker had risen to the priesthood, had since 1847 given a strong impulse to the development of associations among Catholic workmen throughout the valley of the Rhine.[2]

"Let there be no vain words," Kolping used to say, "they but irritate wounds; charity alone can accomplish all."

So active and efficacious was the propaganda he carried on, that in the course of eighteen years, from 1847 to 1865, he succeeded in spreading his journeyman clubs, *Gesellenvereine*, through all the Rhine district. Each *Gesellenverein* was under the direction of a managing committee, composed of a president, who was always chosen among the clergy, two supervisors, four assistants, and an elder, all belonging to the working-class, and had its own club, a hospice, and an inn, where members who were travelling, or strangers, were sure of finding

[1] On Georg Heinrich Von Vollmar, his past, his disagreement with Bebel and Liebknecht, and the sympathy he enjoys among Catholics, see De Wyzewa, *Le Mouvement Socialiste en Europe*, pp. 125, 147, 255, 276.

[2] On Father Kolping, his life and social action, see the work by Laurent Janssens, *Adolphe Kolping, l'apôtre des artisans*. Bruges: Desclée et de Brouwer, 1891.

protection and accommodation. When Father Kolping died, in 1865, there were in the Rhine country alone about four hundred *Gesellenvereine*, with eighty thousand members.[1]

From the success obtained by the publication of his remarkable book on the social question and Christianity, Monsignor Ketteler readily understood the great importance the development of Father Kolping's journeyman clubs would have for the Catholic Socialist party, by whom he caused them to be adopted and supported.

Besides, the struggles of the *Kulturkampf* had made the Catholics feel yet more imperatively the necessity of their being united and well organised, the better to withstand the persecutions of Government.[2]

The clergy also soon perceived the advantages to be derived from the Catholic journeyman clubs, and sought to give them the strongest possible impulse. The wide diffusion of these clubs is in great part due to the efforts of ecclesiastics, such as Herr Schings, Herr Kronenberg, Vicar of Aix-la-Chapelle; Herr Laaf, Vicar of Essen; Herr E. Klein, the Domcapitular of Paderborn; and, most of all, Abbé Arnold Bongartz. The statutes of the clubs underwent successive modifications, yet are all founded on one type. Each club is bound to remain faithful to the teachings of the Church, and its members may not belong to the Social Democratic Associations, which deny God and have a programme contrary to that approved of by the Church—*Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus.* Although they choose different patron saints, according to the various trades, most of the clubs are likewise under the patronage of Saint Joseph, who was an humble artisan, and sometimes of Saint Paul, who was likewise a labourer and an ardent defender of the rights of labour. The members must be workmen and Catholics; honorary members alone, who take

[1] See J. Rae, *Contemporary Socialism*, p. 243 (Swan Sonnenschein & Co.); Jannet, *Le Socialisme d'État*, p. 174.

[2] On the numerous associations formed among members of the bar, students, artisans, Catholic professional men, see Wermert, *Neuere socialpolitische Anschauungen*, etc., chap. iv.; *Das Katholischsociale Vereinswesen in Deutschland.*

no active part in the direction of the club, may be chosen among the wealthy classes and manufacturers. The persons entrusted with the direction must enjoy the consideration of the clergy, but need not be priests. The workmen thus united should, above all, and with all their might, strive to avoid being taken "in tow by capital," *im Schlepptau des Kapitals.* Strikes and coalitions among work people ought not to be absolutely excluded; under the iniquitous capitalistic system of contemporary society they are frequently the artisan's sole arm of defence. The clubs ought to keep aloof from politics, unless when the interests of the Church are in danger, in which case they are bound to take part in the struggle. The closest union should exist between the workmen forming part of these clubs, and they should discuss their interests with the greatest calmness. Who can be better fitted than the workman to know the wants and sufferings of his own class, to point out the evils that afflict him, and to battle for his own salvation? The workman can certainly never be saved from the tyranny of capital by listening to the false promises and seductive lures of the Liberal school, but through union and concord among labourers, among all those who suffer more or less in the same manner, and whose hopes tend towards the same end. Now, while each club has its own sphere of action, and must attend to its local wants and necessities, it must, however, together with all the others, be guided by the same ideal, and work for the realisation of the common aim.[1]

"Quæ congregationes," says a report on the *Arbeiter Vereine*, "id agunt et expetunt, ut fides catholica nec non morum sanctitas in sodalium animis alatur, confirmetur,

[1] Rudolph Meyer, in his remarkable work, *Der Emancipationskampf des vierten Standes*, Berlin, second edition, 1882, has tried to give exact statistics of these clubs, but they are so numerous, and, above all, embrace such varied forms, that any very precise account of them becomes a most difficult undertaking. Sufficiently exact statistics of them have been published by the *Arbeiterwohl*, July, 1889, but, as Abbé Hitze himself communicated to me, from that date up to the present day the number of the Catholic Socialist Associations has considerably augmented.

augeatur atque vitæ condicio in meliorem statum redigatur. Regimen aut certe regiminis summa penes clerum est.

"Ad finem propositum contendunt, eo quod: (1) Vitam omnem religione imbuere et ordinis cuiusque virtutem amplificare et exercere student; (2) concionando et disserendo sodales edocent; (3) ea instituunt, quæ ad emendaadam et sublevandam operariorum conditionem idonea videntur esse; (4) sodalium animos ad humanitatem, liberalitatem, honestatem confirmare nituntur.

"Patrones hæ congregationes venerantur plerumque S. Josephum, S. Paulum, alios. In numerum sodalium admittitur, quicumque operariorum fidem catholicam profitetur ætatis annum duodevicesimum excessit neque civilis honoris aut existimationis expers est."[1]

There are now Catholic journeyman clubs, *Katholische Gesellenvereine*, on the model of those founded by Father Kolping, Catholic apprentices' associations, Catholic associations of master-workmen, of mining operatives, etc.

The associations founded on Kolping's model are most numerous; they count nearly a hundred thousand members, and are spread throughout almost all the Catholic towns. They aim at moral and intellectual improvement, have even in some cases savings banks of their own, and have gone so far as to found, as at Berlin, an academy for the cultivation of the artistic taste of the workmen employed in manufacture.

The associations of Catholic miners in the coal basin of the Roer are very numerous and important.

On the contrary, the Catholic associations for production, patronised by Monsignor Ketteler, are but few in number, and have not in general proved a success.

It would be a long task to enumerate in detail the programmes and tendencies of all these associations. Before closing this rapid survey, I must, however, notice the Catholic savings and credit associations, the Catholic associations of factory girls, and the widespread Catholic social associations, into which members of the middle-class and industrialists are

[1] Published by the *Arbeiterwohl*, pp. 148-149, July, 1889.

also admitted, and the object of which is to discuss and study the social question from the Christian point of view.[1]

In these associations the priests address the workmen, at least once a week, on the rights of labour, Socialism, and the social question. The workmen take part in the discussions, and in this manner the priest has the means of thoroughly understanding the wants, tendencies, and aspirations of the working-classes.[2]

Although the Catholic labour associations all tend more or less towards identical aims, yet they are not bound to each other by any species of obligation, and each association tries to confine its action within the limits of its own particular programme. However, the need of a stronger union, and the necessity felt of having one sole direction and a programme in common, are daily urging them to join together into one single body.[3]

In the presence of the widespread agitation thus promoted by the clergy among Catholic German labourers, the Catholic industrialists perceived how necessary it was for them to unite also. And thus, on the initiative of a few industrialists, an association of masters was formed, the actual president of which is Herr Franz Brandts, with Abbé Hitze as secretary-general. The organ of this association, the *Arbeiterwohl*, is one of the best written reviews in Germany, and is not wanting in boldness nor in largely conceived views; Herr Brandts is a

[1] All this widespread Catholic social movement is seconded and led by a number of Catholic papers and reviews, among which the most important are the *Arbeiter Freund*, directed by Herr Schimpt at Munich; *Die Bauernzeitung* and *Der Westfalische Bauer*, organs of the Catholic peasant associations of Westphalia; the *Reinisch-Westfalischer Volksfreund*, the *Tremonia*, of Dortmund; the *Essener Volkszeitung*, the *Westfalisches Volksblatt*, the *Leo*, the *Katholisches Volksblatt*, the *Katholische Volksbote*, the *Volksfreund*, the *Paulinus Blatt*, etc.

[2] See the address delivered, at the last Congress held at Liége, by Monsignor Fischer, Coadjutor Bishop of Cologne, and published in the *Gazette de Liége*, 9th September, 1890.

[3] *Ibid.*

most convinced advocate of the necessity of State regulation of labour.[1]

The association, "proceeding from the conviction that an efficacious struggle against the numerous evils connected with the great manufactory system, and the dangers which, in consequence of these, threaten civilised society, is only possible on the ground of Christianity, and setting aside all political questions, proposes to co-operate for the improvement of the condition of the working-classes".[2]

According to the second article of its statute the association seeks to attain this end by "supporting the religious, moral, and material interests of the labouring-class, and especially:—

"1. By aiding all efforts to raise the standard of education and of Christian life (encouraging good conduct in the factory hands, allowing them to rest from work on Sundays, organising and extending, under ecclesiastic direction, associations of working men and women, supplying them with good reading, etc.).

"2. By endeavouring to procure greater cordiality in the relations between contractors and workmen (interesting the former in the family conditions of the latter, etc.).

"3. By improving workmen's dwellings (cheap and healthy dwellings, moderate rents, etc.).

"4. By providing for the education, instruction, and recreation of the working-class (infant schools, institutions for imparting elementary and technical knowledge, for teaching domestic economy and needlework to women and girls, associations for recreation, etc.).

"5. By founding, with the co-operation of the workmen

[1] On the manner in which this association was founded see Wermert, *Neuere Socialpolitische Anschauungen*, etc., pp. 89 and 90. The statute is printed on the cover of each number of the *Arbeiterwohl*.

[2] Art. 1 of the "Statut der Verbandes Katholischen Industrieller und Arbeiterfreund," published in each number of the *Arbeiterwohl*. The association is composed, according to Art. 3, of effective and honorary members. The effective members, or those having a right to vote, can *only* be *Catholics*. The honorary members are named by the presidency.

themselves, economic institutions for their advantage (funds for the relief of the sick, savings banks, funds for relief and for advancing money, funds for the relief of the aged, widows' funds, courts of arbitration, the first necessaries of life furnished at low cost, war against usury, etc.).

"6. By attending to the hygiene of the working people and their families (proper ventilation of workshops, etc., bathing establishments, supervision of midwives, prohibition of work being over-protracted, limitation of working hours for women and children, etc.).

"7. By founding institutions for assuring the life and health of the workmen (precautions to ensure safety, proper insurance of workmen in case of accidents)."

Claude Jannet says that the association of German industrialists forms one of the great forces of the Catholics in Germany. And it is certainly a rare thing to see great industrialists patronising institutions and legislative measures which the greater part of industrialists throughout the rest of Europe oppose in the name of their own interests.

The *Arbeiterwohl* discusses the wants and interests of the working-class in the most practical manner, and never allows class or religious prejudice to prevent it from entering into the fundamental questions of our economic system; its conclusions, and the concessions it daily makes to the claims of the socialists, are much larger and of more importance than are generally those of the industrialists of Protestant Germany.

But if the Catholic clergy in the industrial towns of Germany have shown, and still show, such unceasing energy in behalf of the social question, striving to bring masters and employed together, and compelling them to study the problems which are of such vital importance for modern society, their action in the rural districts has by no means been less vigorous and persevering.

At the first meeting of the Catholic social associations, June, 1868, a permanent section was named, charged with the promotion "of the moral and economic improvement of the working-class". Baron Von Schorlemer-Alst, who belongs to

one of the noblest and wealthiest Catholic families of Westphalia, was a member of this commission.

In 1862 Baron Schorlemer-Alst withdrew from the army to live on his estates in Westphalia, which are, for the most part, situated in the district of Burgensteinfurst.

Unlike the provinces of Eastern Prussia, Westphalia has few large properties (*latifundia*); landed property is much sub-divided, and the rural constitution of the country is very similar to that of France. The condition of the peasantry is, consequently, much superior to what it is in the greater part of the other provinces of the German Empire.

However, after 1850, free contracts, liberty in fixing the rate of interest, liberty to change residence, the power granted to all of giving promissory notes, ended by driving the peasantry on in the fatal path of debt, and by handing over a number of small properties to the great landowners, or to bankers.

Baron Von Schorlemer-Alst perceived the serious danger that threatened the prosperity of the peasantry, and, in 1862, invited seven wealthy proprietors, his near neighbours, to join him in studying the difficult problem, and thus founded a society for the protection of agrarian interests. Then, by the publication of several important pamphlets on the laws of succession and on the condition of landed property, he excited quite a ferment among the population of Westphalia in favour of the movement he had initiated.

Breuker, a small farmer in the district of Reklingshausen, immediately followed this example, and founded an association of peasants in his own district.

In 1867 the various associations founded on the initiative of Von Schorlemer-Alst, united into one central association, naming as president Baron Von Alst, and as vice-president Farmer Breuker, the two men to whom they owed the formation of the *Westfalischer Bauern-Vereine*, which, in the course of but a few years, were destined to exercise such a great influence on the social economy of the country.

In an address delivered in 1887 the baron related the difficulties he had met with in the beginning of his apostleship.

'When the first *Bauern-Vereine* were formed, they met with 'opposition on all sides. It was the word *Bauer* that principally excited objections. Other names were proposed. . . . No one wanted to be called a 'peasant,' and the *Bauern-Vereine* have rendered no small service in thus bringing once more into consideration the honourable German name of *Bauer*. For my part, I consider that no name is more fitting for us all, from the prince down to the lowest day-labourer, than that of peasant or countryman, and if we all act together as loyal countrymen, for the good of our Fatherland, we shall be worthy to bear this name with honour."[1]

In another speech, which he made at the Congress of German Agriculturists at Berlin, 18th February, 1880, Baron Von Schorlemer-Alst said: "The duty of a great proprietor essentially consists in his showing that he is a true Christian in his relations with his Church, to whatever confession he belong, in his family, in all his private conduct. . . . He should live as a Christian, not only in the midst of the people, but with the people. We are bound to distinguish ourselves from those who consider the possession of a large rural property merely as a lucrative investment for their capital, or as a pleasant means of escaping from the heated towns in summer. We must share alike the sufferings and the joys of the people. Thus will be easily formed that bond which should unite great, small and middle-class proprietors. . . . Upon this ground perfect unity will be attained the day that all, even to the lowest day-labourer, can feel that there is one level upon which we are all alike: namely, that before God we are all useless servants. That is true equality; then shall we behold, and with the best results, the true social hierarchy naturally restored by the spontaneous will of the other classes." Large proprietors, according to Schorlemer-Alst, have up to the present been too eager for their own interests, and too indifferent to the wants of the people, whom, in their selfishness, they have unconsciously driven into the arms of atheism and social democracy. "The owners of large estates should, above all things, recognise their duty, which binds them to take the

[1] Jannet, *Le Socialisme d'État*, p. 197.

lead of the small and middle-class proprietors, even at the cost of making important sacrifices in order to do so. If they encounter prejudices and antagonism, they should vanquish these by their example and practical conduct. In thus taking the lead of the small and middling proprietors, we must not, and I declare this aloud, *we must not do so with any pretension of haughty patronage*, but with that true benevolence which will dispose us to share their sufferings, and render us quick to help them whenever it lies materially in our power, and willing to do so with all our heart. I think that if the wealthy landowners were but to fulfil their duties, of which I can merely give a rapid sketch, it would really not be so difficult for them to form, on social ground, a close alliance with the small and middling proprietors. And I feel convinced that the privileges, the abolition of which they bewail, but which it is impossible to restore, would be willingly and spontaneously granted and offered by the small and middling proprietors to the great landowner if the latter would only live among them, and thus fulfil exactly his duties towards them. But one thing is essential. If the large landowner wishes to have influence, it is my opinion that he must show himself, in all the acts of his life, as the type of a free, independent man. Now, it was precisely to facilitate the accomplishment of these duties that Providence granted him the inestimable gift of independence, which is a consequence of his position as a wealthy proprietor. Hunting and sport, and all the rest, are certainly very fine things. I fully appreciate their value; but it is not in these, gentlemen, that the duties of a great proprietor consist; his duties are of a higher order. Particularly at the present day, we may not deny the gravity and urgency of this. *There is a considerable evil to be repaired, and an imminent danger to be warded off.* All large and wealthy landowners ought to be persuaded of this: that at any moment we may fall into an abyss, and behold a formidable tempest let loose."[1]

The difficulties which Von Schorlemer-Alst encountered at the beginning of his apostleship were not few. The

[1] Jannet, *Le Socialisme d'État*, p. 195.

thousands of electors who had just obtained the franchise, and whom he hurled against the Government candidates, caused Count Bismarck to reflect seriously, and in 1871 a ministerial rescript ordered the dissolution of the Westphalian *Bauern-Vereine*, considering them as political associations prohibited by law. However, Baron Von Schorlemer-Alst, far from losing courage, actively continued the work he had begun. The disbanded associations formed together again under another name, and by adopting a few slight modifications in their statutes, were able to spread more rapidly, thanks to the opposition of the Government, which the country people, for the most part, looked upon as the adversary of their religion and their clergy.

In order to gain admission to the association it is necessary, according to the fourth article of the statute, to belong to one of the two Christian confessions,[1] to be occupied in agriculture, and to possess some rural property of whatever kind. The agricultural constitution of Westphalia, in which province landed property is much sub-divided, consequently allows of a very great number of small farmers, who are really peasants, to form part of the association, which is not, therefore, as it might at first seem, reserved only to the wealthy class The number of those who do not even own a small piece of land is relatively very limited in Westphalia, and even the very small farmers, who form the majority of the population, are admitted into the *Bauern-Vereine*.

The association counts at the present day over twenty thousand members, and has spread throughout Westphalia and the neighbouring cantons of Hanover and the Duchy of Oldenburg, in the Rhine province; it has a paper of its own, the *Westfalischer Bauer*, which has now been in existence for more than twenty years, and which all the members receive. The *Westfalischer Bauer* treats of education, instruction, and agriculture; it is written by competent persons, and is a thorough and useful adviser for the small farmers. It takes a

[1] At the Congress of Fulda the bishops authorised the Catholic associations of labourers to admit Protestant workmen.

very active part in the electoral conflicts, and has largely contributed in giving Westphalia a group of deputies who are almost all Catholics.

The *Westfalischer Bauer* is protectionist to the back-bone, and enjoys so much credit that almost all the petitions of which it took up the initiative have ended by obtaining the reform of laws which were considered as detrimental to the interests of landed property. For example, to its influence is due, together with several other laws, that which secures to the rural proprietor the integral transmission of his estates.

The *Westfalischer Bauern-Vereine* direct their efforts in a special manner to dissuading young peasants and farmers from abandoning the class in which they were born.[1]

The directing committee has been able, by means of ably stipulated contracts with insurance companies, to secure many and real advantages for the members. The *Westfalischer Bauer* seeks with much sagacity to support the farmers in their war against low prices, and by clubbing together the requests of the members the association succeeds in obtaining from large firms, and by prompt payment, seeds and manure, agricultural implements, and cattle, at prices which are relatively very low. There is now an office established at Münster for the testing of seeds and manure.

Baron Von Schorlemer-Alst encourages the members of the association in the formation of co-operative societies for the sale of food, and has also tried, but with little success, to

[1] On the importance and development of the *Bauern-Vereine* consult Jannet, *Le Socialisme d'État*, chap. iii., "Les associations rurales en Allemagne"; Dr. Martin Fassbender, *Die Bauern-Vereine*, Paderborn, 1888; Abbé Arnold Bongartz, *Das Katholischsociale Vereinswesen in Deutschland*, p. 124 and following, Würzburg; Rudolph Meyer, *Der Emancipationskampf der Vierten Standes*, vol. i., p. 357 and following, 2nd edition, Berlin, 1882; Wermert, *Neuere Socialpolitische Anschauungen in Katholicismus innerhalb Deutschlands*, p. 84, Jena, Fischer, 1885; Laveleye, *Le Socialisme Contemporain*, p. 164 and following; C. Jannet, "Les faits économiques et le mouvement social," in the *Correspondant*, pp. 345-370, 25th January, 1887; La Tour du Pin Chambly, "La question social chez les catholiques allemands," in the *Association Catholique*, vol. xx., series iv., p. 434; A. Kannengieser, *Les Catholiques Allemands*, pp. 115-138.

organise the sale in common of agricultural produce. One of his principal endeavours is *to prevent the destruction of small patrimonies by the tax agents and law courts.* To attain this end he has founded offices for legal advice, composed of Catholic jurists and lawyers of long experience, who assist the members of the *Westfalischer Bauern-Vereine* in drawing up their wills, etc. Wishing also to save the members from useless and expensive law-suits, he has, since 1886, introduced some very useful measures. Members who are in litigation with other members first apply to conciliators, *Vergleichsämter*, chosen among their neighbours. If the decision pronounced by these does not give satisfaction, the litigants then name a court of arbitrators, *Schiedsgericht*, which judges the case according to law, and the decisions of which have the same obligatory force for members of the *Westfalischer Bauern-Vereine* as those given by the ordinary law courts.

Usury was long the greatest danger for the small Westphalian holders, the permanent danger to which all small tenures were exposed. Consequently, Baron Von Schorlemer-Alst could not remain indifferent to the question of credit. The *Bauern-Vereine* serve their members as intermediary in all small offers and demands of capital. In 1877, under the influence of the association, the Provincial Diet established a bank of credit on landed property, *Landschaft*, which lends at 3·50 per cent., with 0·5 per cent. towards the sinking fund, and 0·25 per cent. for the expenses of administration. With the payment of the annual interest of 4·25 per cent. the debt is liquidated in the course of from forty to fifty years, according as the *Landschaft* re-forms its capital more or less rapidly by means of compound interest. As every one is aware that credit on land can only be of real efficacy when payable at a long date, it will be easy to understand the great services rendered by the *Landschaft.*

Besides this, there are one hundred and forty-five *Sparundbarlehnkassen-Vereine*, or banks of mutual credit, of the Raiffeisen type, founded for short-dated loans on rural property, and all connected with the *Ländliche Centralkasse* at Münster.

This central bank controls the accounts of the local banks, pays discount on all bills accepted by them, accumulates their funds, and keeps an open account with them. Having the power of drawing money on banks and savings banks, the *Centralkasse* is enabled to advance to the local banks sums exceeding those it has received from them. In 1887 it had received 1,375,764 marks from the local banks, and had lent them 1,569,757 marks; but it had received 855,606 marks in deposit from other banks, to which it had refunded 582,262 marks. On the 31st December, 1887, it closed its account with the other banks with a debit of 221,756 marks.

Baron Von Schorlemer-Alst, as almost all the Catholic German economists, maintains that a great part of the evils from which the German peasantry suffers, had their origin in the introduction of Roman law into Germany, towards the end of the middle ages. Free trade, liberty in the choice of a residence, liberty to alienate landed property, and even the increase of commercial relations with foreign countries, are, according to Von Schorlemer-Alst, the original, if not the sole causes of the present economic troubles. He also is of opinion that it is necessary to re-introduce, by means of prudent measures, the equilibrium between supply and demand; that the State ought to place a check on the tyranny of capital; and, above all, to oppose the development of joint-stock companies.[1]

The example of the *Westfalischer Bauern-Vereine* was soon followed in many agricultural districts of Germany. There are the Bavarian *Bauern-Vereine*, with over 12,000 members; those of Silesia, with more than 8500; those of Nassau, with above 3000; of the Duchy of Baden, with more than 4000; of the Eichsfeld district, with 1450 members; of Arn, with 1400, all these have their own newspaper, co-operative societies for the sale of articles of food, Raiffeisen banks, and are daily extending themselves more rapidly.

At Neuss, in the Rhine province, in 1877, through the initiative of Baron Felix Von Loë, a society of popular economy was founded, the scope of which was to protect the

[1] Jannet, *Le Socialisme d'État*, pp. 203 and 204.

material interests of the population in everything concerning rural economy, the education of the people, trade and insurance. In 1882 this association was transformed into the *Rheinischer Bauern-Vereine*, and in 1888 it already counted over 29,000 members. Unlike the Westphalian associations, those of the Rhine country have given a powerful impulse to the co-operative societies for the sale of consumable articles.

Especial notice is due to the association among the vine-growers of the Rhine country. "For some time now," says Abbé Bongartz, "the industrial condition of the vine-growers has changed. Formerly the consumer of wine addressed himself directly to the vine-grower, and laid in his provision of wine; but the large industrialists bought up the grapes wholesale, and sold only wine of their own making. This latter system ended by placing the small vine-growers in a most precarious situation, as, in order to be able to withstand competition, they were obliged to sell their wine at the prices of the large producers. Besides this, foreign red wines were imported, and falsification increased to a great extent. The consequence was that, in the sale of the German wines, no account was taken of their quality or density. Things had reached this point when the vine-growers resolved to unite, and thus do in common what it was impossible to effect separately. The society caused cellars and magazines to be built and arranged, large enough to contain all the grapes of the members, which were carried there as soon as gathered. The process of making the wine is in this way better attended to and watched over than it could have been by each isolated vine-grower. The sale of the wine thus produced is entrusted to a committee chosen by the association, and which treats directly with the purchasers. The wine now enjoys a good reputation for quality and price, and the small vine-growers, finding their position improved, have again taken heart. The first associations of this kind were founded on the banks of the Aar; they are now nine in number, with five hundred and forty-six members. On the Rhine there are three, with thirty-five members; on the Moselle two, with one hundred and fifty-three members. In all, fifteen associations, with seven hundred

and thirty-four members."[1] Since 1882 the number of these associations has greatly increased, and the *Nassauischer Bauern-Vereine* carry on a most active propaganda on their behalf.[2]

Baron Von Schorlemer-Alst began his propaganda in the face of the greatest obstacles, with the Government for adversary, and opposed by Prince Bismarck. Things even got to such a point that he was threatened with being placed under the supervision of the police, as the head of dangerous associations. However, all these hostilities have calmed down, and a few years ago the eminent Catholic deputy of the German centre was offered the post of Governor of Westphalia.[3]

What is so wonderful among the German Catholics is, that the initiative came from the higher classes; the men who, among the Catholics, have written the bitterest invectives against the capitalistic system, who have been most vehement in blaming the abuses of large properties, and the long-standing economic bondage of the labouring class, who have most strongly deplored the evils of our present bourgeois system, are not workmen, nor even poor priests, but bishops, canons of the Church, wealthy noblemen, and rich industrialists; in short, all of them are persons whose elevated position ought to be a guarantee of their moderation, and who, by their very nature, would be expected to be most attached to the Conservative programme in economic, as in political matters.

The clergy took the field as soon as they became persuaded that infidel Liberalism was equally dangerous for the prosperity of the labouring classes and the prospects of the Church. The movement began among the upper classes, and the associations of Catholic workmen and Catholic peasants only began to develop after the great Archbishop of Mayence had, with perhaps more efficacy, if with less competency, than

[1] Bongartz, *Das Katholisch-Sociale Vereinswesen in Deutschland*, p. 130 and following. Würzburg, 1882.

[2] See Martin Fassbender, *Die Bauern-Vereine*, p. 164 and following.

[3] I read this in the Catholic paper, *Le Courrier de Bruxelles*, 19th February, 1890.

Ferdinand Lassalle, stigmatised from the pulpit of his cathedral the evils of our present social organisation.

The path followed by the Catholics in their social studies, and that chosen by the associations representing their political and economic programme, are parallel; every year the delegates of the various associations meet to form, by common accord, their political and economic claims, and the entire Catholic Socialist movement, in spite of the long persecution endured at the hands of the Government, and the derision of the Liberals, goes on its way, ever more active, more prosperous, and more daring.

CHAPTER VIII.

ANTISEMITISM AND CATHOLIC SOCIALISM IN AUSTRIA.

Rapid Diffusion of Austrian Socialism—Causes of this Diffusion—Antisemitism and Socialism—Maxen—First Austrian *Katholikentag*—Rudolph Meyer and his Economic and Social Theories—Meyer's Programme and Tendencies—Meyer and the Liberal School—Contemporary Economic Morality, according to Meyer—Meyer and the Corporations—The Evils of Roman Law and the Conservative School—The *Vaterland* Group—Prince Von Lichtenstein—Criticism of the Liberal School—Labour as a Function Delegated by Society—Baron Von Vogelsang—The Revolution of 1848 and its Evil Effects—The Triumph of Capitalist Bourgeoisie—Capital and Industry—Urgent Reforms—Success of Vogelsang—Restoration of the Corporations—Austrian Social Legislation—The Social Duties of Catholics according to Weiss—Blöme—Kuefstein—Costa Rossetti—The Catholics and the State—Catholic Congresses—Catholic Socialists and State Socialists—German Socialism and Austrian Socialism—Causes of the Rapid Diffusion of Catholic Socialism.

A LITTLE more than twenty years ago Austrian Socialism, which is now so active, so powerful, and so much respected, was but a very limited and insignificant affair. No one would then have believed that Socialistic doctrines could have so rapidly over-run exclusively agricultural districts, in which industry had acquired but slight development, whose main resources were derived from the land, and where even agriculture was in rather a backward condition. But the extreme misery of the peasantry, the difference of race existing between the various classes (a fact which always lends a greater degree of violence to economic struggles), the want of a Christian industrial middle-class, the abuse of capital exercised by the Jews, the extensive speculations which have characterised the last twenty years, the numerous monopolies and the economic constitution of the country, are all causes which have aided in

spreading Socialism throughout even the most remote parts of the empire.[1]

In Austria, as in Germany, Antisemitism is neither more nor less than a form of Socialism.[2] We must not lose sight of the fact that, especially in Austria and Hungary, the Jews enjoy an almost exclusive monopoly of industrial revenue, nor should we forget that the press, the banks, and the stock-exchange are all in the hands of the Jews; and that the latter, far from seeking to amalgamate with the rest of the population—as in England, for instance, where but recently it was possible to see a Jew elected even to the post of Lord Mayor of London—hold themselves apart and do all they can to preserve their own traditions and nationality.

The numerical increase of the Jews in Austria and Hungary has always kept pace with their invasion of the economic territory. While, in 1869, to a population of 35,904,000 inhabitants there were 1,154,000 Jews, in 1880 there were, instead, 1,640,708 Jews to a population of 37,741,000. Thus, while the increase of the Christian population has been in the ratio of 0·77 per cent., that of the Jews has been in that of 27 per cent.[3]

The Austrian Jews are not only the supreme arbiters of trade and of the banks, but they are working actively to become the masters of the soil as well. It was not till 1848 in Hungary, and 1862 in the other provinces of the empire, that they acquired the faculty of possessing land; yet in this short lapse of time they have succeeded in becoming masters of 8 per cent. of the entire territory of Galicia; the Rothschild family alone possesses the fourth part of the Bohemian terri-

[1] See J. Rae, *Contemporary Socialism.*

[2] "We think we may affirm, without fear of surpassing the truth, that the Antisemitic deputies are, perhaps without knowing it, simply masked Socialists." See the correspondence of Ernest Nogy de Felso, professor of the Hungarian University of Gross-Wardein, published in the *Réforme Sociale*, 1st September, 1884.

[3] See Brunialti, "La race juive dans le monde," in the *Journal de la société statistique de Paris*, p. 111, 1882; M. O'Neill, "Not at Home," in the *Nineteenth Century*, October, 1886. See also article in the *Association Catholique*, vol. xxvi., p. 216 and following, "Les Juifs en Autriche".

tory, that is to say, seven times more land than the imperial family. In Hungary the Jews, who, in 1869, were barely as one to twenty-two of the whole population, are now proprietors of almost a third part of the territory of the old kingdom of Saint Stephen. They have been assisted in this rapid conquest of the land, not only by the banks, but also by the tax-collectors, who every year put up for sale a number of small properties.

In this manner, so long as the actual wage system lasts, half the industrial operatives of the country, and more than a fourth of the peasants, will labour for the profit of a foreign race, whose difference of religion renders them still more unpopular and odious.[1]

On the other hand the Jews, who carry on large industries, or are proprietors of vast estates, have never sought to do anything to improve the condition of the labouring class, which would contribute to dissipating the tide of hatred and unpopularity that surges around them. A recent inquiry has shown that everywhere throughout the empire the workmen are treated with more severity and exploited with greater avidity by the Jewish industrialists and proprietors.[2]

And thus it is that the poor peasants who have taken up Antisemitism so eagerly, and the operatives who, both in town and country, listen with religious attention to the Antisemitic doctrines of Herr Von Schönerer, are driven to oppose the Jews more from economic than from religious causes.[3]

The priests who, in the churches of the kingdom of Saint Stephen, or in those of Bohemia and Austria, raise their voices against the Jewish usurpers who exploit labour and monopolise public wealth, the priests who preach the doctrine of Anti-

[1] See the *Christlich-Sociale Blätter* of 1886, p. 520 and following, and Jannet, *Le Socialisme d'État*, etc., pp. 44, 64 and 66. See also Walter Kaempfe, "Courrier d'Autriche," in the *Réforme Sociale*, pp. 293 and 302; 1st March, 1887.

[2] See René Lavollée, *Une enquête autrichienne sur la situation de la classe ouvrière dans la Cisleithanie.* Paris, 1888.

[3] See Paul Vasili, *La Société de Vienne*, 10th edition, Paris; *Nouvelle Revue*, 1865; douzième lettre: "L'antisémitisme".

semitism, and the labourers who listen to them, are unconscious Socialists.

In a country where the aristocracy of capital is almost entirely Jewish, where the old feudal nobility, as well as the small landed proprietors, are threatened with being absorbed by the Jews, it is easy to understand the welcome and success which met the theories of the Catholic Socialists, and that they readily found a soil disposed to receive them and to render them fruitful.[1]

From the time of their publication, the writings of Monsignor Von Ketteler had had an immense diffusion also in Austria, where they were read with much interest and enthusiasm.

Herr Maxen, a professor of Göttingen, having come to Vienna with the King of Hanover, to whose son he acted as preceptor, contributed largely to popularising the theories of the eminent Bishop of Mayence. Maxen was of a solitary and haughty nature, and led a very retired life, taking no part in politics. He was, however, in the habit of receiving at his house young men belonging to the aristocracy of Vienna, and with these he would discourse on social economy, discussing in particular the social doctrines of the Church, the questions of wages and usury, the claims of the working-class, and Socialism in general. Among his disciples was Prince A. Von Lichtenstein and the collaborators of the Catholic paper, *Das Vaterland*, which was the property of Count Leo Thun. By degrees the small group that formed around the professor of Göttingen became persuaded that the Church alone could solve the social question, that usury was contrary to Christianity, and that society ought to be re-organised according to the principles of the middle ages. In a congress of Catholics, *Katholikentag*, held at Vienna, Prince Von Lichtenstein and Count Egbert Belcredi, son of a former president of the Austrian Cabinet, supported this argument. Thus did the Catholic social party originate and lay its first foundation-stone.

[1] Paul Vasili, *La Société de Vienne*, 10th edition, Paris; *Nouvelle Revue*, 1865; treizième lettre: "Socialisme chrétien".

But if Austria is to-day the country where Catholic Socialism is most influential, and in which the theories of the Catholic Socialists are most freely accepted and discussed, it is principally the merit of two men whose importance no one will question, Rudolph Meyer and Baron Von Vogelsang.

Rudolph Meyer is beyond a doubt the first economist of the Catholic party. He is a man of erudition, a bold and attractive writer, thoroughly conversant with the natural laws that govern social economy, and enjoys an indisputably high reputation among Liberal Socialists and writers, as well as among Catholics. From Hyndman to Jannet, from Laveleye to Vogelsang, no one has ever questioned his great merit and capacities.[1]

So early as 1887, Dr. Meyer explained at length his social programme at the Congress of the *Katheder Socialisten*, at Eisenach. He then belonged to the group which had been slowly forming around Rodbertus Jagetzow, whose views and programme he shared. He had been forced to fly from Germany on account of a fierce and courageous book against Bismarck,[2] and took refuge in Austria, where he soon became the inspirer of the Catholic feudal party. Although a Protestant, he was not long in becoming the foremost among the supporters of the theories of the Catholic party, and the very soul of their social movement.[3]

In his excellent and original study on the emancipation of the fourth estate, Dr. Meyer has expounded, with great breadth of views and erudition, his ideas on the social question. Unlike almost all the economists of the Catholic party, he is, in the first place, a most convinced partisan of universal suffrage. He believes, and justly, that it is the sole means by which the people, or fourth estate, can take a part in political life, and be safeguarded against the unrealisable chimeras by

[1] See Jannet, *Le Socialisme d'État*, etc., p. 147; Laveleye, *Le Socialisme Contemporain*, p. 102, see note; *Le Correspondant*, p. 362.

[2] Rudolph Meyer, *Politische Gründe und die Corruption in Deutschland*. Leipzig, 1877.

[3] Paul Vasili, *La Société de Vienne*, p. 201.

which until now it had been lured on. The people, through being excluded from political life, and wanting in all experience, had up to the present been incapable of conceiving other than absolute reforms,[1] but when it participates in the political struggle, it will easily learn to distinguish between Utopias and reality.

Rodbertus Jagetzow believed that it would be possible to realise his ideal of social reform (1) by means of a legally fixed minimum wage, and the limitation of the working day for adults; (2) by State regulation of industrial production in view of the collective interests of society; (3) by establishing State co-operative stores. Rudolph Meyer is of opinion that to these measures it would be necessary to add as well the suppression of testamentary liberty, and the protection of small tenures by measures similar to those of the "Homestead exemption laws" in the United States.[2] Indeed, according to Meyer, the State should not only regulate production, but should also, within the limits of morality and justice, regulate the distribution of wealth. Meyer holds that the question of the distribution of wealth is, at the present day, much more important than that of production; for the extension of industry has created, on the one hand, an extremely wealthy class, and, on the other, a most numerous class of extremely poor persons. This infamous distribution of wealth is the reason why, while the upper classes live in a state of luxury which is simply immoral, the wretched people are exploited by greedy speculators, and trained up in sentiments of hatred and revolt.[3]

Up to the present the State has neglected its mission, and when it ought to have been the regulator of production and

[1] See also De Tocqueville, *Ancien Régime;* in the chapter, "Comment vers le milieu du xviii. siècle les hommes de lettres devinrent les principaux hommes du pays, et les effets qui en résultèrent," he has entered largely into this argument.

[2] See the study by Meyer, which opens the book by Rodbertus, *Briefe und social-politische Aufsätze.* Berlin, 1881.

[3] We read also in Aristotle, *Politica*, book v., chap. i., that the State ought to control the distribution of wealth. And much later Montesquieu, *Esprit des lois*, book v., chaps. vi. and vii., dwells on the same idea It is, consequently, no new argument.

distributer of wealth, it confined itself to a very narrow sphere of action, in which its intervention remained sterilised.

The wage system, according to Meyer, as well as to Rodbertus, from whom the theories of the former directly derive, will lead to the same results as did slavery in other times. The strong not only possess the soil, but they possess the men, and force the proletarians to give their labour at a price which is ever on the decrease. Contrary to what the economists affirm, the interests of labour are in open opposition to those of capital and property. Nor can wages rise, for the instruments of production, capital and land, are beyond the reach of the labourers. The value of land and capital is as a dead weight which capitalist society drags after it, and with the present system of unrestricted freedom of contract the condition of the proletarian becomes more wretched from day to day.

The State is bound, however, to seek the means of placing a check on the abuses of capital. A revival of the old laws against usury would be admirably adapted to this end. But it is not enough to combat usury; some control should be placed on the interest paid on such capital as is not put into circulation by the persons who really own it.

The State ought constantly to enlarge the sphere of its duties. It might, for instance, oblige each industry to erect dwellings for its workmen. Then, private industrialists must end by being forced to pay the same rate of wages as the State does to the persons it employs. But the principal attention of Government should be directed to encouraging the development of small holdings; it should even aid in contributing to their formation. Only when they come to possess something of their own will the masses find that it is to their interest that the actual *régime* should continue.

According to Meyer, each trade should have its own fund for pensions and relief, to which the head of each industrialist establishment will be bound to contribute a sum equal to that paid by all his workmen together. Finally, it is necessary to form committees of *prud'hommes* to conciliate disputes arising between employers and employees, and a court of arbitration to

decide disputes which have not been settled by compromise.[1]

In two works published in 1883, one treating of the land-laws and economic legislation of the United States, Canada, China, Roumania, and England, the other on the causes of American competition, Dr. Meyer, in reviewing at length the social question, has likewise sought to make an ample investigation on the agrarian question, to which, for some time, he has dedicated a number of studies which have appeared in various Austrian, French and German reviews.[2]

What is most dangerous and most to be avoided is, according to Dr. Meyer, the optimism of the Liberal school. "There exists," he writes, in speaking of German Liberalism, "a sort of official science which sets itself up as an infallible Church, far more intolerant than the Church of Rome, who, when she interdicts a work, brands the author only as regards the faithful, whereas this new Church puts him beyond the common law. This would-be science waits its watchword from the chancellor's office, and can offer nothing better in the way of scientific progress than a series of specious comments, always alike, and adapted to suit the prince's taste, on economic treatises written some fifty or a hundred years ago, when the economic situation had nothing in common with that of to-day. This school, which of late has surpassed all that was most blameable in the charlatanry of the *Grande Nation*, does not surpass it less in ignorance as to what is happening in the rest of the world, and is far inferior as regards statistical knowledge

[1] All this programme has been stated at length by Rudolph Meyer in his work, *Der Emancipationskampf des vierten Standes*, 2nd edition, in 2 vols. Berlin, 1882.

[2] See R. Meyer, *Ursachen der Amerikanischen Concurrenz*, Berlin, Hermann Bahr, 1883; and *Heimstätten und andere Wirthschaftsgesetze der Vereinigten Stäten von Amerika, von Canada, Russland, China, Indien, Rumänien, Serbien, und England*, Berlin, Hermann Bähr, 1883. See also in the *Association Catholique, revue mensuelle des questions sociales et ouvrières*, the articles by Meyer, "Des souffrances de l'agriculture," vol. xviii., pp. 389 and following, and 678 and following; "De la surproduction économique intérnationale," vol. xvii., pp. 334 and following, 467 and following, and 580 and following, etc.

of its own country. Not one of these plagues of official German science is in a position to show the present ruinous economic situation in Germany, because it ought not to be known, and it ought to be thought that everything is proceeding for the greater good of the empire. Whoever dares to doubt this, or, what is worse, seeks to know the truth, becomes a dangerous person, an 'enemy of the empire,' who deserves to be forthwith silenced, ruined, sent to prison, or across the frontier. You may, doubtless, go on writing, even when the professor's chair is forbidden you, but then the dominant *coterie* sinks you in silence. So much for the doctrines and tactics of the Liberal school."

After having examined with profound erudition the economic institutions of the various States of Europe, Asia, and America, Dr. Meyer, without attempting to deny the influence exercised by ethnical and natural agents on the development of people, affirms and demonstrates that the most characteristic cause of the different phenomena met with in social and economic life, is to be found in the laws and the consequent constitution of the State.

The growing evils of modern society are not the necessary result of natural laws, but, in great part, the fruit of the laws we have made, for, as Rodbertus so justly said, it is not physiocracy, but "anthropocracy" that rules the domain of political economy.

Now, what are the principles of Liberal economics? It maintains that the interests of production should be preferred to those of the producer, the interests of wealth to those of humanity. All that Marx has written on the ruinous effects of Liberal economics should be accepted even by those who cannot accept the programme of social re-construction of the Jewish democrat.

As things actually stand, a Christian reform is not possible unless its promoters are convinced that property confers no rights whatever on the person of our fellow-man, but only duties towards him. If we consider from this point of view the relations between the three combined agents of production —capital, direction, and labour—we shall at once see that the

first entirely eludes this law, and far from binding itself to duties towards the other two agents, exploits them without other check than that of their resistance, which is as interested and excessive as its own unreasonable demands. What takes place in a workshop takes place, likewise, but on a vaster scale, on markets of more or less extent, and also on the universal market, owing to the association of capital, of masters, or of workers. Society knows no other condition of equilibrium than that of opposed forces, an equilibrium which is essentially unstable, since these forces are not guided or maintained by any principle of public right. In consequence of this the formula of our present industrial *régime* is not even *force oppresses right*, but *force ignores right*.

The problem which now confronts modern society, and which we are bound to solve at whatever cost, is not how to suppress capital, but how to reduce capital, by means of a reform of actual laws and morality, to the fulfilment of its social duties towards the elements associated with it in the work of production. Religion may reform morals; but the action of the law, which should likewise be inspired by religious principles, must become most efficient and active, and restrict within just limits the growing tyranny of capital.

Social legislation, even in the States in which it has made the greatest progress, as in Switzerland and England, the two nations which have most endeavoured to protect the condition of the workers, has not, in spite of the apprehensions it awakened, yet gone the length of aiming that severe blow at the right of property which consists, according to the Liberal economists and the jurists of the school of Roman law, in every obstacle to the liberty of capital.

The *Heimstätten und andere Wirthschaftsgesetze* exactly proves to us that the States which, by means of restrictive laws, have curbed the tyranny of capital, and protected by import duties the production of their own workers, are precisely those in which the greatest social wealth exists.

In the United States of America the restrictive laws on the rate of interest, the faculty of lending money, pursuit for debt, and liberty of capital, no less than the customs duties on

European importation, by means of which wages have been doubled, while placing a momentary check on the expansion of capital already formed, have favoured the formation of new capital by the masters, as well as by the workmen, who are thus enabled to rise more and more in the social scale.

What is above all necessary, according to Meyer, is to seek to restrict the liberty of capital by means of legislative and administrative measures, at the same time in such manner as to favour its formation rather than its accumulation. It is by no means true that the consequence of a fixed maximum of interest would be to raise the value of the minimum, nor that the protection of the insolvent debtor would diminish the credit of the solvent one; nor, finally, that the repression of stock-jobbing would withdraw capital from productive enterprises. We have numerous examples in various States of Europe and America to prove quite the contrary.

The economic morality of the present day has reached so low a pitch that even Roman Catholics, forgetting the numerous dispositions of the councils, do not scorn to take part in immoral speculations. "It was truly comic," observes Dr. Meyer, "to see of late intelligent men who, while they discoursed with grave respect on the prescriptions issued by the councils against usury, did not experience the faintest scruple before the enticement of a profit of seventy-eight per cent. held out to them by a certain large loan society. The moral sense is already so much perverted in this respect, even among honest people, that their conscience fails to see any harm where there is a prospect of gain."

But if it is necessary to oppose the accumulation of capital, and to curb its excesses by means of wise and prudent laws, it is, on the other hand, indispensable that national industry be protected by a system of customs duties. "If," said Dr. Meyer, a good many years ago to an eminent French writer, "if I wish to maintain any particular national industry in the possibility of competing on the home market with similar goods of foreign production, I must first inform myself of the difference of price of the raw material to be transformed or employed in the transformation. If it necessarily costs ten

per cent. more at home, I must calculate ten per cent. as an element to be considered in the protective duty. But this is not all; so far I should only have protected the manufacture, and not the operative. If, on the contrary, I only consider the latter, and in his favour impose on the industry the legitimate precautions and protection due to him, by means of limitation of the working day, responsibility in case of accidents, etc., I should be burdening the manufacture with an increase of outlay in wages for perhaps another ten per cent. Therefore, it is not only in view of the reproduction of capital employed, but also with regard to the proper sustenance of the working family, that I must calculate the protective duty necessary, not to secure for the national production the monopoly of the home market, but so as to allow of its competing upon equal terms with foreign production. In the case I have now cited, it would be necessary to fix a duty of twenty per cent., under which the industrialist would only be able to live at the expense of the operative, and above which he would be enriching himself at the expense of the national consumer."[1]

When the different trades have been organised into corporations, it will become necessary, in order to complete the system, to extend a similar organisation to the large industries.

What it is most urgent to effect soon, as a first step towards the social and labour laws, is the normal limitation of the duration of work in factories to ten hours, or to eight hours in case of day and night work; the limitation of the labour of women and of children; the inspection of factories by special inspectors, all infractions of the law on the part of the owners to be punished by heavy fines, always accompanied by imprisonment.

It is, moreover, necessary to render obvious that all Euro-

[1] See the article by La Tour du Pin Chambly, "Études de législation sociale," in the *Association Catholique*, 15th October, 1883, pp. 482 and 483, and 15th November, 1883, pp. 586-598. See, likewise, the other important studies by R. Meyer, already cited. This is, however, a strange theory held by the *Katheder Socialisten;* they persist in supporting and developing certain forms of protectionism which are at utter variance with the interests of the people.

pean states are bound, in their social interests, to favour by means of international agreement the productions of those countries in which the operatives are well treated, *viz.*, are protected by proper laws and earn a good wage—as, for instance, in Switzerland and parts of England and France—interdicting as far as possible commercial relations with countries in which the producer is abandoned by an inhuman legislation to the tyranny of speculation, and provided with a wage insufficient for his wants. In this manner the latter would be compelled to follow the example of the former.

"We now," says Dr. Meyer, "must face this question of vital importance: Can Europe, as it is actually organised, resist American competition? And on what conditions? By a thorough reform of its social constitution as understood by true conservatives? or by a revolution in the Socialist sense? For there can be no other alternative."

In studying the agrarian question, particularly from the standpoint of American competition, Dr. Meyer proclaims himself a partisan of individual property, provided, however, that the principle be closely associated with another: that the soil constitutes property of a peculiar nature, and cannot by the legislator be assimilated for any of its conditions of use or transmission to those of capital. The national soil belongs to the families of the nation, and not to a class of cosmopolitan capitalists, who, under the pretext of economic liberty and free credit, speculate dishonestly upon the poor country people, and are the pest of agricultural labour.

The proprietor of a portion of the national soil has certain obligations towards society, in which he cannot fail without transgressing against his duties. The proprietor of land may not free himself from every tie of social organisation, and the State cannot tolerate, much less provoke, evictions for debt or for arrears of taxes, without lending a hand to its own ruin. It is true that the peasant of to-day is not, as in former times, bound to the glebe, but the glebe is ever bound to the peasant, inasmuch as it constitutes a capital, the fruition of which demands special conditions which are incompatible with frequent changes of proprietors, and, above all, with agglomeration

or sub-division, unless within certain limits that vary according to the nature of the soil and the local conditions.

The diffusion of the doctrines of Roman law, by converting service in kind, which was incumbent on the possessor of the soil, into a fixed quota of land-tax, and prescribing rights of way and the equal division of patrimony, so that the increase of the population is attended by a corresponding surcharge of burdens and diminution of the revenue of the soil that supports it, has resulted in the most anti-social and anti-economic phenomenon that the intelligence of man could bring about. And what have these results really been? On the one hand the decrease of the population and the consequent difficulty in finding hands to till the land, as in France; on the other, the desolation of the agricultural districts, as once happened in Mesopotamia, and is now the case in Hungary, and even in Bavaria. A Hungarian village in the neighbourhood of Gross-Wardein, which in 1848 numbered one hundred and thirty-seven hearths, and seventy in 1867, now counts but thirty-five; in other words, is in a fair way of disappearing altogether This is undoubtedly the consequence of having assimilated rural property to every other species of property. Taxes, rights of division and succession, the capital necessary for making improvements, are so many causes which, within a certain lapse of time, have had the inevitable effect of reducing the number of Hungarian land-holders by almost 500,000. Now, the same evils, produced by causes more or less of the same nature, are to be met with in almost all the countries of Europe. In Italy, where the protracted application of Roman law has had the most injurious effects, the agrarian question has never ceased stirring up troubles from the time of the Romans down to the present day, and this has happened under all the different forms of government in a country that could not have been endowed with greater natural advantages.

What a contrast as compared with the United States of America and with Canada, where the generating principle of legislation is so different from that existing in Europe, and where rural property is exempt from sequestration to an extent that varies according to the states, but is always consider-

able. In these countries this guarantee of the domestic hearth is officially extended to women also, even without the husband's consent and when the wife has brought no dower; it is sufficient to make a declaration in court. And yet it is frequently a question of land to be put under culture, and for which landed credit should be more largely employed.

It is not so much from agricultural credit, which eats up the revenues and renders the farmer tributary to the capitalist, but from the revenue of the land itself, that we may expect the slow, but sure formation of agricultural credit, and the means of favouring this formation consists, in the first place, in a notable diminution of the land tax.[1] Nor should we pre-occupy ourselves with the fact that the State will thus lose the surest portion of its revenues. Moreover, the State is bound to reduce its present mad outlay, for centralisation and militarism, the two pillars of the actual *régime*, "render the economic situation absolutely indefensible, and only to be compared to that of Germany after the Thirty Years' War".

"The Conservatives," says Meyer, "have either forgotten everything, or have learned nothing. They have forgotten the duties attached to the possession of large properties, which they merely consider as an investment for capital, whereas property implies a social duty. They have forgotten that the original occupation of the soil, from which their rights of property derive, was intrinsically linked to considerable restrictions of these same rights. They have forgotten that the abolition of those obligations and servitudes, which formed so many obstacles to the changing of proprietors and to the divisions and dismemberment of land, was a blow dealt to that social system which it was their interest to preserve. And they have

[1] It is needless to say that we cannot accept these views expressed by Dr. Meyer, who seems to be inspired by serious economic prejudices. If the State diminishes its outlay it should, in the name of justice and equity, do away with the indirect taxes which oppress the great mass of those who live by their labour. The land tax is the one tax that least affects the workers and consumers. This excessive tenderness displayed by the so-called Conservative Socialists towards property, which they would fain protect by means of duties, while freeing it from taxes, is, to say the least, of but doubtful sincerity.

not understood that beyond the ocean, in opposition to this new society to which, seeing at first but its advantages, they had adapted themselves so willingly, another and more modern society was forming, a society more democratic in its political customs, and still more so in its economic laws, and whose industrial and agricultural importance was increasing, and was destined to go on increasing more and more. They have not understood that the present economic *régime* is become unbearable, and that in the economic crisis they are preparing they will be held responsible for the evil they have been unable to ward off. Their liberty and modern rights, acquired after '89, will have no more weight in the balance than had those time-honoured rights '89 threw to the winds, when our fathers, even at the eve of the Revolution, had no more presentiment of its coming than we have to-day of the revolution that may be ready to burst forth to-morrow."

On taking refuge in Austria, Dr. Meyer, although a Protestant, became, as I have said, the very soul of the Catholic Socialist party. It was he, in fact, who, in a series of articles published in the *Vaterland*, dictated the programme of the party.

The editors of the *Vaterland* formed, and still form, the true centre of the Catholic Socialistic party; their frequent meetings were attended by Count Von Falkenhayn, who was subsequently named Minister of State; Count Zallinger, Count Blöme, Baron Dipauli, Prince Von Lichtenstein, Count E. Belcredi, etc. When Count Taaffe came into power the Government seemed ready to accept a good part of the views of the Christian Socialist group, and, indeed, a largely conceived bill, comprising many of the theories held by the *Vaterland* party, was presented at the Reichstag. However, the four commissions appointed to examine the bill did not get through their work by the end of the session, and at the opening of the following one the Catholic Socialist group determined to confine their action to the passing of a bill for the organisation of the smaller industries into corporations, and for this Count Belcredi was named reporter.

The bill was violently opposed by all the Liberal press,

and defended with much ardour by the *Vaterland.* However, notwithstanding the attacks of the Jewish writers and their papers, many cities pronounced themselves in its favour, and at Vienna there was held a congress of employers who accepted it in its integrity. The bill triumphed, and the party by which it had been supported turned their victory to good account.

However, Meyer, who had been the soul of the whole thing, who had traced out in his articles the programme of the Catholic Socialist party, and had so ably and intelligently defended it against the attacks of the Liberal school, was compelled to leave Austria, as a few years before he had been forced to quit Germany.

When Bontoux, with the assistance of Dunajewski, founded the Austrian Provinces Bank, Meyer attacked Count Taaffe violently in the *Vaterland.* The minister was led, perhaps against his will, to expel the Prussian professor, who took refuge in Paris, where he became one of the principal collaborators and inspirers of the *Association Catholique.*

Unlike Dr. Meyer, Prince A. Von Lichtenstein, who was for a number of years, and still continues to be, one of the most active leaders of the Catholic Socialist party, is neither an economist nor a brilliant politician; his elevated position, however, has rendered him one of the most conspicuous members of the group that formed around the *Vaterland.* A Catholic and a clericalist by birth, as well as by conviction, he has for many years been a staunch supporter of the Catholic Socialist party at the Reichstag, at public meetings, and at Catholic congresses.

"The entire system of modern society," said Prince Von Lichtenstein, in a remarkable speech delivered a good number of years ago, "is as simple as it is abnormal, and may be described in a few words. In the higher spheres a numerous and uncommonly wealthy class of *rentiers* (fund-holders) who, by means of *coupons* and interest, are daily able to amass an ever-increasing portion of the labour of the people, without being held, by way of compensation, to any sort of personal or material obligation; a financial oligarchy, few in number, but powerful, and whose corruption equals their power, free of all

control they dispose of the fortunes of the *rentiers*, and, as the latter are without defence, speculate wantonly upon them. Below is the impoverished and crushed mass of the people, of the labourers and producers, artisans, trades-people, operatives, contractors, great and small land-holders. And, above all, the Liberal State reigns in chronic penury."[1]

What remedies must the Catholics oppose to all these evils?

"There are two things," continues Von Lichtenstein, "of which we must not lose sight: first, that there are very few institutions which we should allow to subsist intact; second, that there is not one that ought to be purely and simply destroyed. In this modern society, in which the *rentier* class is relatively so numerous, production has developed according to the actual state of things; much labour is expended on objects of luxury, and but little, in comparison, on the common necessaries of life. Consequently, any rapid passage to a more salutary state of things, any precipitate reform, would produce terrible evils and a powerful reaction. We are forced to admit that, through the fault of others, the entire edifice is damaged and its foundations are giving way, but we have not the right to overthrow it, for the ruins would crush the innocent as well as the guilty."[2]

According to Prince Von Lichtenstein, the theory of free competition, as, indeed, almost all the theories of the Liberal school, has proved most ruinous to the people.

"The ill-regulated action of movable capital has once more involved us in all the evils of past ages, only they are now intensified. In the State debt you find an old acquaintance—the tribute of ancient times. It is true it is no longer paid by a neighbouring people to its conqueror, but by an impoverished State to a class of *rentiers;* however, that does not in the

[1] See the "Discours du prince de Lichtenstein sur la question sociale," in the *Association Catholique*, 15th June, 15th August, and 15th September, 1878. See, likewise, the "Rede des Fürsten Alois Lichtenstein, gehalten in der Schlussversammlung des Katholiken-Tages am 2 Mai 1889," extracted from the *Vaterland*.

[2] See the *Association Catholique*, p. 414, 15th September, 1878.

least alter its effect for the ratepayers. The colossal debts with which both great and small landed estates are burdened, have brought us back to the tithes of the middle ages, doubled, tripled, with this difference, that then the feudal nobility was charged with the expenses of military service, administration, police, and judiciary functions—in other words, all the work that at the present day devolves on the bureaucracy and the standing army; whereas the actual class of fund-holders (*rentiers*) is not bound to any personal or material service. The differential tariffs of the railways, the monopoly and despotism they exercise, have surpassed in more than one respect the artificial tortures of earlier modes of communication. The discount paid by the banks of issue is a simpler means of speculating on trade, and of raising the price of the most indispensable commodities, than were the vexatious import-duties of which our forefathers complained; finally, the issue of bank-notes is a more convenient method of diminishing the value of money, and debasing the coin of the realm."[1]

The evils that have been caused by the modern economic system are so profound that it would be folly as well as iniquity to deny them. What then must we do in order to alleviate them, and to come to the assistance of their victims? Christian charity can accomplish many things, but cannot do all; something very different is needed. We must, in the first place, acknowledge that the cries of sorrow that reach our ears are but too legitimate. Moreover, the benefits conferred by charity cannot be substituted for justice; the duty of charity cannot be imposed on any one, that of justice should be imposed upon all. We must, therefore, distinguish between Christian virtues, which can render endurable even the most trying conditions, but which are essentially of a supernatural order, and obligations belonging to the exterior order, and which should be imposed even on those who are devoid of virtue. Thus, Christian resignation is a virtue, but the victim of an injustice, whether he be resigned or not, has a right to demand

[1] See the number of the *Association Catholique* as cited above, pp. 411 and 412.

that the injustice cease and that every one contribute to this end. Consequently, when Socialists deplore a social injustice, we must have the courage to own that it is such, and every Christian is under the obligation of seeking to discern what is just from what is unjust in the complaints of those who suffer. Modern political economy, which is founded on *laissez-faire laissez-passer*, is at the same time anti-social and iniquitous, since from the *laissez-faire laissez-passer* system have arisen the great social injustices of our present society.

Prince Von Lichtenstein agrees with all the Democratic Socialists in considering that labour is, or at least should be, *a function delegated by society*. "We are accused," said he one day in the Reichstag, "of wishing to go back to the middle ages and to restore feudalism. Feudalism was founded on an indestructible truth, on the principle that labour is by no means a private concern, but *a function delegated by society* to each of its members."[1] Whoever admits that labour is a social function must naturally admit that the State ought to be the supreme regulator of the production and distribution of wealth.

But the man who exercised the greatest influence, who, by his active propaganda and apostleship, rendered the legislation in favour of the corporations possible, who, by his unwearied ardour, aided so powerfully in the diffusion of the theories of Christian Socialism, was Baron Karl Von Vogelsang, the most eminent among the Catholic publicists in Austria. He died at Vienna towards the end of 1891, having already beheld his efforts crowned with success. In the *Vaterland*, and most of all in his own *Monatsschrift für christliche Social-Reform*, which for twelve years he directed with intelligent care and untiring perseverance, he was the most fervent apostle of Christian Socialism. And when, on the 10th December, 1888, the seventieth birthday of the distinguished writer was celebrated at Vienna, it was not without good reason that the

[1] See Jannet, *Le Socialisme d'Etat et la réforme sociale*, p. 46. See, likewise, the notable address delivered by Prince Von Lichtenstein, 2nd May, 1889, and published on the day following in the *Vaterland*.

most eminent men of his party honoured him as their leader, as the most illustrious and venerable of the Austrian Catholic Socialists: and Count Blöme, Dr. Pattaï, Count Belcredi and Dr. Brzobohety vied with each other in their demonstrations of esteem and admiration.

Like Dr. Meyer, Baron Von Vogelsang was a Prussian and a Protestant, but while still young he was converted to Catholicism, of which, when later on he embraced the theories of Christian Socialism, he became the most convinced and ardent champion. He was a most bitter enemy of Liberalism, and readily understood that the Revolution of 1848 had produced the same effects in Austria as that of 1789 had caused in France. According to him, the old social order overthrown by the Revolution had rested on the fundamental principle that all property "should be as a part of the common fortune of the nation, granted for private enjoyment in exchange for services rendered to the community". No private property was then exempt from its correlative duties; the lord of the manor was bound to certain public duties for that portion of the public revenue which the peasant procured him; the burgess was debtor towards the town and the guild for the monopoly of his trade. The duty of the reigning prince was to represent the social and political interests of the nation both at home and abroad, in virtue of which he was the object of special honours, and was granted the enjoyment of vast domains. Thus, all possession of property constituted a function entailing certain rights and duties. However, the old institutions degenerated, the sentiment of rights over-ruled that of duties, and but too frequently the rights attached to a function became oppressive for those who ought to have profited by the corresponding duties. No power existed capable of carrying out a bold reform, and the old institutions ended by being overwhelmed by the Revolution. But the Revolution only served to bring about the dissolution of the social organism, the absorption of all public social functions by the omnipotent State bureaucracy, and the transformation of those rights that guaranteed the social patrimony of the nation into private property, which the individual may use

and abuse at pleasure. The Revolution of 1848 produced similar effects throughout the rest of Central Europe, except in Belgium, where the bourgeoisie had already effected the transformation, and had become absolute master of power, and enjoyed the possession of property exempt from all duties. The bourgeoisie, in order to effect its conquests, made use of the people, whom it lured with the mirage of liberty. And the people unwittingly fought for its own ruin, and to form and extend the large class of the proletariat. Together with the bourgeoisie triumphed capitalism; that is to say, the maxim that all wealth is individual property, without burdens or duties, and is destined to procure to its proprietor the largest possible amount of advantages, without any regard for the good of the community, or of the men employed in procuring them. This maxim finds its purest expression in moneyed capital, or value considered in the abstract, apart from the object, value which, under whatever circumstances and whatever may happen to the object itself, must bring in its interest to the capitalist. It is under this form that the capitalistic idea actually dominates over the entire economic life of nations. The States, with their countless millions of public debt, are its tributaries; the soil is subject to it to the extent that it not only gives it the ground rent, but the greater part of the produce of labour as well; industry may now be said to labour almost exclusively for capitalism, and the towns and cities belong to it from attic to basement. The "governing machine," estranged from every nobler ideal, can now only act through it. Everything has become its property or its prey. "And what has become of the labourers?" The city operative, despoiled of his proud independence, deprived of the assurance of his daily bread, has been brought down to the level of the proletarian. The peasant, driven from his land and his home, has likewise been reduced to the proletarian. The workman, degraded by the abasement of trades, has no guarantee beyond the new State laws that his new lord and master may not leave him in his old age to die upon a sack of straw; under the *régime* of capitalistic economy his condition has become wretched beyond all conception. But the work-

man, while resenting his misery, is unconscious of its true cause.[1]

Now, a remedy must be found for all this; we must reconstruct the corporation system on solid foundations, and seek to place a check on this tyranny of capital, which presents the greatest danger for modern society.

Capital not only lords it over industry, but also over agriculture, which, by abusing recent agricultural progress, it has injured in its most vital interests. It has been possible in our times for an American company to attempt to monopolise the corn trade in Russia and America. It was thought that protective duties would serve as a means of safeguarding agricultural interests, but even were the State to double them and to reduce the taxes, we should only begin all over again, for in the course of another generation every advantage, every privilege, would again, under form of mortgages and promissory bills, have been capitalised, returning to the strong boxes of the capitalists, while the situation would have become worse than before.

[1] See the important article by Vogelsang, "1848 un anniversaire révolutionnaire en Autriche," in the *Association Catholique*, May, 1888. In each number of his important *Monatsschrift für christliche Social-Reform*, Vogelsang published noteworthy studies on social economy. Among many others consult, "Die Freiheit der Arbeit," June, 1880, pp. 241-263; "Zins und Wucher," May, 1884, pp. 233-258; June, pp. 321-342; July, pp. 345-350; August, pp. 419-432; September, pp. 457-480; "Zur Handwerkerbewegung," August, 1884, pp. 401-407; "Zur Arbeiter Krankenkassen Frage," November, 1884, pp. 602-612, and December, pp. 656-661; "Zur Geschichte der 'Niederoesterreichischen Escompte-Gesellschaft' und zur Erklärung der in der letzten Zeit vorgekommenen Defraudationen," January, 1885, p. 418; "Zur social-politischen Organisation der Grossindustrie," April-May, 1886, pp. 188-196; "Beiträge zur Wucherfrage," August, 1887, pp. 393-405; "Zur social-politischen Debatte mit Herrn Michael Flürscheim," August, 1887, pp. 405-411; "Die Nothlage der Landwirthschaft," June, 1881, pp. 277-291; "Zum Schlusz der social-politischen Debatte in Betreff der Land Verstaatlichung," November, 1887, pp. 561-579; "Ueber das Recht der Arbeit," March, 1888, pp. 109-141; "Die Grundgedanken einer socialen Reform," vol. xi., pp. 617-623; "Der Sociale Stoffwechsel," vol. xii., pp. 113-124, 1890; etc. See, also, the important pamphlets, *Der Kapitalismus*, *Die Bauernbewegung*, *Die Konkurrenzfähigkeit in der Industrie*, etc.

Nevertheless, though he accepted almost all the fundamental programme of State Socialism, Baron Von Vogelsang, in replying to Flürscheim, made a vigorous stand against land nationalisation. "I am," he wrote, "by all the strength of my early memories, of my sentiments and my reflections, of all my social conceptions, which, however advanced they may appear, have no other basis but the old Christian civilisation of the Western races, I am a declared adversary of this all-powerfulness of the State, of the Byzantine smothering-up of every liberty, of all intellectual life, which would be the necessary consequence of land nationalisation.

"Catholics, however, deceive themselves in believing that the solution of the social question may be effected through the sole intervention of the Church, excluding that of the State. We can never hope to see the establishment of a social organisation based on justice towards the weak, unless under the influence of Christian laws. But neither must we allow ourselves to be led away by illusions; we must try and understand that it is impossible to oppose any remedy to the evils of modern society, infested as it is by capitalism, without an energetic intervention on the part of the State."[1]

The social organisation of to-day recognises only individuals, each of whom fights for his own interests in this savage struggle. According to Liberal doctrines the weak must therefore succumb, while the strong conquers. But the strong is not he who possesses the better abilities, or is most favoured by circumstances, but the stronger in capital; therefore, this so-called liberty and equality only favours movable capital and large capitalists. It is, consequently, necessary that the corporations of trades, which alone can furnish a guarantee to the working-class, be invested with legal personal rights; that is to say, they must acquire the power of administering movable goods and real estate, be invested with juridical authority in regard of their members, and, finally, must form autonomous bodies under the supervision of the State. The social question is at the same time a moral ques-

[1] See Vogelsang's reply to Flürscheim in the *Oesterreichische Monatsschrift für christliche Social-Reform*, August, 1887.

tion and an economic question. The aim of Christian society should not be the protection of any particular class of workers, since in society organised on Christian principles every one ought to work. In place of the horizontal lines of society, formed by the rich and idle, should be formed a system of vertical supraposition according to the various trades and professions, for no one should remain in idleness, but each should occupy the post allotted him in the corporative organisation. The insurance of industrial operatives, outside the corporative system, is but an obligation laid on the other members of society to support the invalids of the large industries, which are thus enabled to exploit their workmen without giving themselves any further concern on the subject. It is useless to expect any radical change until the corporative system has been re-established on a solid basis.

Catholics, or at least many among them, deceive themselves on the effects of charity, and have recourse to "merciful anodynes". Now, charity is insufficient, and to insist on substituting it for justice is a most unworthy mode of interpreting Christian teachings, for in this way obligations which every man is bound to consider as duties which he owes in justice are left to the ministrations of charity.

"We must," said Abbé Eichhorn, deputy to the Reichstag, on the occasion of Vogelsang's jubilee, "we must return to the social and political doctrines of our forefathers. By these doctrines labour is reinstated in its rights, and man is restored to his resemblance with God; the earth is considered as a deposit which God entrusts to the labourer, in order that it may be administered for the common good. After the Church, that mighty guardian of all great moral truths, it is to our venerated Vogelsang that we are indebted for this return. He it was who, the first among us, exhumed from the dust of the past the social and political morality of Christianity, and scattered it as a fruitful seed in the hearts of alarmed Christians."[1]

[1] See the speech delivered by Abbé Eichhorn on the occasion of the Vogelsang jubilee, and published, together with an account of the festivities, in the *Oesterreichische Monatsschrift für christliche Social-Re-*

And, certainly, not one of the least of Vogelsang's merits was that of having promoted and carried out the investigation into the conditions of labour in Austria, which, by the cruel truths it revealed, caused a profound sensation throughout the empire, and urged the Reichstag on to the path of social reforms.

In spite of the war waged against them by the Liberal press, conducted for the most part by Jews, the theories of Rudolph Meyer and Karl Von Vogelsang, which were warmly supported by the *Vaterland*, and accepted by men of high social standing, such as Prince Von Lichtenstein, Count Blöme, Count Belcredi, Count Kuefstein, etc., exercised, as they were bound to do, an undeniable influence on the social politics of the empire, and on the economic tendencies of Austria.

Indeed, the industrial laws passed in 1883 were the first great victory of the Catholic party. The corporations, which had been abolished in 1859, but had not completely disappeared, were restored throughout Austria by a bill of the 5th March, 1883, and in Hungary by that of the 21st May, 1884. The Austrian bill of 1883 authorises, likewise, the re-establishment of the district corporations of the large industries, without which the corporations of trades could have no real importance. But in spite of the resolutions frequently voted by the Catholic congresses, the difficulties which, up to the present, have encountered the bill, have been such as to render its passing difficult in the extreme. With article 107 of the Austrian law on the re-establishment of the corporations, and by means of a series of provisions, and the control and continual intervention of the State, an attempt has been made to prevent the abuses of the monopoly of the compulsory guilds.

The re-establishment of the corporations was effected in the midst of the greatest obstacles. But in 1887, in Cisleithania, they already reached the number of 4548, and, despite

form, December, 1888. See, likewise, the speeches made by Count Gustavus Blöme, Herr Ferdinand Meyer, Herr Joseph Roth, and Dr. Pattaï, which are given in the same periodical, pp. 637-669.

the criticisms of adversaries, the hostility of the Liberals, and the very frequent difficulties to which their restoration gave rise, they have not turned out badly in the least; the opinion given of them, especially in Austria, depends principally on the views held by the writers and the provinces to which they belong.[1]

In consequence of the earnest persistence of the Catholic deputies, a bill was passed, 8th March, 1885, introducing the limitation of the labour of women and children, and fixing eleven hours as the maximum of a day's work. The Catholic deputies did not even draw back before the legal determination of the minimum wage,[2] and at the annual meetings of the *Freie Vereinigung der katholischen social-Politiker* a great part of the programme and tendencies of Socialism was accepted. It is unquestionable that the Catholic Socialists agree with the majority of Democratic Socialists in their demolishing criticism of the present social order, and the investigation into the condition of Austrian workmen, carried out with so much breadth of view and lofty principle by Baron Von Vogelsang, even now serves as basis to the attacks of social democracy.

"Individualism," said Count Blöme, at the Congress of Liége in 1890, "has lost its vitality, and the actual economic *régime*, based on competition and egoism, is destined to perish. The Church cannot but support the claims of the working-classes, who strive for their own rights and redemption."[3]

At the same congress Count Kuefstein confessed that the condition of the working-class, considering it on the whole, has not improved either morally or materially. A reform is,

[1] See the article on this subject by Victor Brants, "La réglementation du travail en Autriche," in the *Réforme Sociale*, vol. i., 1889. The sympathy of the socialists towards the re-establishment of the guilds is a well-known fact. See Winterer, *Le danger sociale, ou deux années de l'histoire du socialisme*, pp. 7 and 13, Paris, Palmé, 1885; Ceinmar, *Les doctrines des congrès ouvriers de France*, p. 66 and following, Paris, 1880.

[2] See C. Jannet, *Le Socialisme d'État*, etc., pp. 154 and 155.

[3] See the *Gazette de Liége*, 8th September, 1890. Also on the theories of Blöme, see his remarkable speech published in the *Association Catholique, revue mensuelle des questions sociales et ouvrières*, vol. xxii., p. 685 and following; and the *xx^me. Siècle*, October, 1890.

consequently, necessary. The physical decline of the people, which is the result of their economic condition, is incessant and continuous, and the State has not only the right, but the duty of assuming their defence. It is hence necessary not only to establish an international regulation of labour, but to oblige each State to protect the physical integrity of the labourers, and at the same time to fix by law the minimum wage and the maximum limit of the working-day.[1]

On the other hand, the clergy, though those of the rural districts are rather ignorant, and in the cities too worldly, by no means holds themselves aloof from these agitations.

The most eminent among the Austrian Jesuits, in an important work on moral theology, for the use of the clergy and of ecclesiastical seminaries, has given definitions of capital, wages, profit, income, etc., which have a marked affinity with those formulated by Socialist writers.[2] A few years ago Father Albert Weiss, provincial of the Dominican monks in Austria, in a letter addressed to M. Decurtins on the proposal of Switzerland to establish an international legislation on labour, thus recapitulates the *duties of Catholics with regard to the social question*.[3]

"You know," wrote the intrepid monk to the man who had been the first to support successfully the necessity of an international regulation of labour, "you know better than I, sir, that the views to which you seek to open a way have in general, so far, met but with obstacles. It is said that Thiers, and Gambetta after him, did not believe in the existence of a social question. If the assertion is true, it is very grave, for it proves better than anything could of how little value those two personages were as statesmen. Yet, nevertheless, it is by

[1] See the supplement of the *Gazette de Liége*, 9th and 10th September, 1890.

[2] F. Costa Rossetti, *Institutiones ethicæ et Juris naturæ*. Rodriquez de Cepeda, in the *Elementos de derecho natural*, Valencia, Domenech, 1887-88, has given a full exposition of the theories of F. Costa Rossetti.

[3] This letter of Father Weiss, addressed to the Swiss deputy, M. Gaspard Decurtins, was first published in the *Basler Volksblatt*, and reproduced later in the *Association Catholique*, pp. 302-308, 15th March, 1889.

no means incredible, for even at the present day there are persons to whom the very word is repugnant, and who forbid its being uttered before them. And yet, what is most surprising, these are persons occupying elevated positions, and who have many responsibilities. I am not aware if you have any such men in your country, but I could name you others who, when the conversation touches upon this argument, are most inclined to say: Let us pass on; with us, thank God, there is no social question. What these persons really understand by social question I feel at a loss to say, and they would probably be much embarrassed if they had to say it themselves. I suppose they mean a species of general conflagration embracing the whole world, to such an extent that no one can even dream of extinguishing it. May God protect us if things ever come to such a pass as to compel these ostriches to cry out: Yes, there is a social question. It is a question that varies according to the different countries, but is everywhere becoming an urgent actuality, and upon all men of good-will devolves the duty of doing their utmost to ward off the catastrophe that threatens us. We must not wait till it become, perhaps, too late, for it is not the desperate situations that demand the greatest solicitude, but those where an attempt at reform may yet be made with some hope of success.

"But there are persons who think and say that all might go well if this undertaking presented less difficulties. It is almost impossible to enter into this subject without making common cause with individuals of the most suspicious character, or being exposed to the evil of falling into the most dangerous errors. Besides, things have now reached such a point, that in making these essays we can never be sure but that we may be aggravating the evil, and, despite all our precautions, adding fuel to the flame. The state of things is not yet, thank God, come to such a pass that we need fear that at the slightest contact the bomb will explode. Such a thing may possibly happen in certain cases in England or in Russia, where it is said to be equally dangerous to attempt bringing about a reform or to let things go their own way. If, in virtue of an unfortunate principle of inertia, we have

allowed things to go very far, it would, however, be a deplorable exaggeration to believe that all is lost beyond resource. The wretched victims of modern social disorganisation have thrown themselves into the arms of individuals who have abused too much of their confidence, and have made them unwitting instruments for the furtherance of their own ambitious views and political intrigues.

"The primitive truths upon which repose social life and the mutual relations of mankind have been placed in doubt, and absolutely perverted. And this evil is so inveterate and deep-rooted that even the best disposed seem to have lost all conscience of what is just and true. Consequently, the noblest duty, the wisest mission an ecclesiastic can exercise at the present day, is to recall to society the old principles of justice so long neglected, and finally forgotten; those principles which are the very foundation of all social life. Nor must we allow the fear of committing errors to arrest us in the study of the social question. What would you think of a man who did not get out of bed for fear of breaking his leg? or of a doctor who stayed away from his patients so as not to risk contagion? My meaning will not have escaped you, sir," continues Father Weiss, "though I express myself in so categorical a manner. In your excellent speech you declared with much energy that it is the sacred duty of the State to participate in the solution of the social question. I am entirely of your opinion. Yes, it is the right, and, consequently, the duty of all Governments to attend seriously to this question. We are very well aware that the modern State is but too apt to attribute everything to itself, not in the name of duty, but in the name of right, and that more than one statesman audaciously abuses his omnipotence in holding that there is not one angle of human life which is not entirely and exclusively subject to him. Nevertheless, there are some superior minds that have only done so with reserve and diffidence, and who are not without a certain feeling of remorse when they hear it repeated that in the social question the State has a great mission to fulfil. But neither their audacity nor their reserve can prevent us from proclaiming the truth, or from saying, as

we have already done, that on this ground the State has a vast field open for its action. However, we must not expect or hope that the State can do all. We cannot agree with the partisans of the exclusive absolutism of the State any more than with the Democratic Socialists, and all those, no matter by what name they choose to be known, who would impose on the State exclusively the obligation of providing for all kinds of misery and all material wants. These two tendencies, openly hostile one to the other, yet in reality closely allied, are as erroneous in themselves as detrimental to the State; therefore it is that we declare them both to be equally unacceptable. No, the State alone has neither an exclusive duty nor an exclusive right. The State is not all nor can it accomplish all. It ought to suffice it, as it suffices all of us, that it accomplish at least what it can, and what constitutes its duty; and we desire with all our hearts that the members of the State accomplish all that they can towards remedying the social evil."

The apprehensions felt by so many noble-hearted men with regard to the social question, act, perhaps, as a salutary preservative against imprudent impulses. "If, then, the State wishes to be faithful to its mission with respect to the social question, it must not only not usurp human liberty, but must fully guarantee it its proper sphere of action. By human liberty we mean, as we shall explain, two things: internal and personal liberty for each individual to live according to his conscience, and external liberty to move and act according to his rights and to divine law as a member of a great body, or in harmony with other members of the community, so as to attain a condition of exterior and material prosperity, and to complete his moral and intellectual development. In other words, this means that the State, instead of confining liberty of association and social action, or of seeking to absorb them, ought to second them in order to help in giving a good solution to the social question." But perfect harmony between the State and society cannot be possible without the intervention of religion, without which it will be impossible to obtain any solution of the social question. "With these

reserves, we associate ourselves entirely with the position that the State has a great mission to fulfil, in order to dissipate the clouds which at present cover the social horizon. And it is intentionally that we say the *State*, in its widest sense, for we could never arrive at any result if this State or that were alone to adopt certain measures. It has, indeed, been tried, but without any satisfactory results. In the present situation of things, isolated experiments, even when made with the greatest sincerity, are liable to encounter insurmountable obstacles, from the sole fact that in other countries quite the contrary is practised. If, even formerly, when the various social *régimes* presented yet greater diversities than to-day, the admirable institutions which protected society would, under similar conditions, have remained sterile, how much more so now that all barriers are removed, and the remotest lands are scarcely less distant than they once were from the cities adjoining them! Thus it becomes necessary that in these times of international relations there should also be a social international labour law, which, at least in its principal features, should be uniform everywhere, under the natural reservation, that in applying it the special social conditions of each nation should be taken into account."

"It is now a recognised principle," said the Jesuit Father Kolb, in the course of a sermon preached at St. Peter's, Vienna, in 1890, "that for the solution of the social question it is absolutely indispensable to have an international regulation of labour that will include the whole civilised world."

The re-establishment of the corporations, according to the bill passed in 1883, was only effected in surmounting the greatest obstacles, and the difficulties to which the corporations gave rise,[1] principally through the fault of the bureaucracy charged to protect and watch over them, were the cause of much disappointment. But the Catholic Socialists, instead of allowing this to discourage them, attributed, not altogether without

[1] See V. Brants in the article "La réglementation du travail en Autriche". See also the articles in the *Association Catholique*, 15th August, 1885, and 15th March, 1887; and in the *Monatsschrift für christliche Social-Reform*, January, 1889, etc.

reason, these difficulties and obstacles to the officials, and to the defects of the bill itself. At the congress held in Vienna in 1888, the reporters of which were Count Blōme, Prince Von Lichtenstein, Count Kuefstein, Professor Schindler, etc., it was determined that the principal scope of the efforts for the reform of social and economic order should be directed to the organisation of society into corporative bodies.

At the congress of the following year the Catholics demanded "that the guild rights relative to admission should be extended; that above all they should have the right of opposing dispensation from the trial of ability, and of establishing a second trial of ability for members wishing to pass from the grade of workman to that of master". They further expressed the desire of extending the trial of ability to factory industrials who produce wares similar to those produced by handicraftsmen, and to prohibit the employing of day-labourers instead of artisans, and so transforming into great machine industries what are capable of being exercised as hand industries.

In discussing the question of wage, the congress principally insisted on "the regulation of production as it now results from unlimited competition. Competition should be limited by means of commercial treaties for foreign goods, as well as by a regulation of national production for home produce, maintaining an equilibrium between the legitimate interests of both sides concerned by protective customs duties suited to this end. Besides, this regulation and the organisation of the great industries into corporations must necessarily establish a just proportion between supply and demand." Nor did the Austrian Catholics content themselves with this in their congress of 1889. They considered it necessary that even the permission of founding new industrial establishments should be made subject to trials of ability, based on the economic solidity of the enterprise, its probabilities of duration, its probable results, the need of employment among the population, etc.[1] At the congress held in 1890, in which

[1] See the account of the deliberations in the *Christlich-Sociale Blätter*, p. 254 and following, 1889.

twenty-three bishops and six hundred priests took part, the following motions were formulated and approved by unanimous vote: The necessity of restoring the corporations; of still further limiting the work hours of women and children, of reducing the maximum limit of the working day already fixed by Austrian law at eleven hours, etc.[1]

It is manifest that nowhere do the theories of the Catholic Socialists present greater affinities with those of State Socialists than in Austria.[2] Baron Von Vogelsang, Prince Von Lichtenstein, Count Belcredi, etc., derive more or less from the most advanced State Socialists of Germany, and the person who exercised the greatest influence on their views and tendencies, was precisely a German State Socialist, Rudolph Meyer, whose powerful speech for a length of time held so much sway in the congresses of the *Staats-Socialisten* in Germany.

Certainly, German Socialism is more scientific and has greater width of views than Austrian Socialism. Nevertheless, in no country in the world have Socialistic doctrines so profoundly taken root among the people as in Austria. In almost all parts of the empire, the fund-holder class (*rentiers*), that of capitalists, and frequently also the class enjoying the revenues of the soil, are of different race and religion from those of the working-class and the peasantry. Consequently, the lowly Bohemian peasant, who every day sees the land of the poor sold by auction, and the already large domains of the Jewish proprietors thus added to by the action of the tax-collector, feels his hatred increase towards those whom he considers as foreign tyrants and usurpers. A very insignificant person, who is probably quite unknown beyond the Austrian confines, Herr Von Schönerer, has been for many years, and is, perhaps, still, the most popular man in the empire, only because he represents the antisemitic idea. And, naturally, antisemitism,

[1] See the *Gazette de Liége*, 8th December, 1890.

[2] On the causes of the rapid diffusion of Socialist doctrines in Austria, see R. Meyer, "Le socialisme d'État en Autriche," in the *Association Catholique, revue mensuelle des questions sociales et ouvrières*, vol. xiv., p. 209 and following.

which in Austria is so widespread and so popular, furnishes a fruitful field for the diffusion of so-called Conservative and Catholic Socialism.

Moreover, in few countries were the old Conservative institutions so firmly and deeply rooted as in Austria. When the democratic hurricane of 1848 swept away many of the old institutions, the peasants and the working people thought that liberty would have assured them a better future. But when they saw that their condition had not improved, and that the Jews were little by little monopolising the national wealth, when the workman's position became more uncertain and insecure, if not worse than before, the Christian workman understood that only those old institutions could have restored him tranquillity for the present and security for the future. Hence it comes that the Catholic Socialists, basing their criticisms upon real poverty and discontent, and striving to bring about a return to the old institutions, have met with such favour and success.

CHAPTER IX.

M. GASPARD DECURTINS AND SWISS CATHOLIC SOCIALISM.

Socialism and Democracy in Switzerland—Slow Diffusion of Socialism—Socialism and Democratic Institutions—Catholics and Protestants—Monsignor Mermillod and the Sermon at Ste. Clotilde's—A Socialist Bishop—The Duties of Catholics and the Social Question—The Catholic Socialists and the State—Evolution of the Catholic Socialists—Gaspard Decurtins—The Leader of the Ultramontanes—The *Sécrétariat Ouvrier*—Decurtins and the International Regulation of Labour—Decurtins and Favon—The Conference at Bern—The *Basler Volksblatt*—Tendencies of Decurtins—Théodore de la Rive and the Social Danger—Dr. Feigenwinter—The Congress at Bâle—Catholic Labour Associations—The Congress at Olten—Catholics and Democrats—Swiss Catholics and Socialist Democracy.

IN all Europe, Switzerland is perhaps the country in which the condition of the working-class is most favourable, and where the conflict between employees and employers is least intense, and the danger of a conflagration least to be dreaded. The absence of those agglomerations always attendant on the large manufacturing system, the relative stability of the rate of wages, and the very attitude of the manufacturers themselves have rendered the workman's position more secure than in other countries. The countless number of institutions founded by the industrialists for their workmen daily tend to increase, and contribute admirably to alleviating the hardships of the laborious lives of the latter. Profit-sharing, which is admitted and practised in many cantons, especially in those where industry has made most progress, pensions for maintenance, co-operative societies for the sale of articles of food, *Consumvereine*, savings banks, mutual relief societies, permanent associations between workmen and industrialists, which serve as a prelude to the introduction of the free

guilds,[1] have all combined to preserve Switzerland from the excesses and violence of Democratic Socialism. It would seem, moreover, that Switzerland, where the people take part more or less directly in the legislation and government, should be protected against the contagion of Democratic Socialism more even by its political institutions than by economic causes.

An accurate study of the history of Socialism shows us clearly that Democratic Socialism has appeared later, but with far greater intensity, and has spread in its most acute form in those countries in which the people was not called, or was called very late, to take part in political life. Now, the people of Switzerland can exercise its sovereign power independently of the elections by means of the *Referendum*. In eight cantons the citizens even participate in the ordinary legislative functions. The more important laws cannot come effectively into force if, after having been framed by the Cantonal Assembly, they have not also, one by one, been voted on and approved of by the people. In the other cantons of the Federation the people may, when it wills, demand the *Referendum* for every law.[2]

[1] See the history and development of the labour institutions in Switzerland in the study by Anatole Langlois, "Patrons et ouvriers en Suisse," in the *Correspondant*, 10th February, 1884.

[2] Zürich, Bern, Schwytz, Soleure, the Grisons, Aargau, Thurgau and Bâle (rural) are cantons with *obligatory Referendum;* the others have *optional Referendum*, which is only granted upon express demand. There are two sole exceptions: the canton of Fribourg, which has no *Referendum*, and that of Vaud, which only has it for laws concerning finance. German Democratic Socialism, which, until recently, had been contrary to representative government, finally admitted it at the Halle Congress, 1890, recognising, however, the necessity of modifying it by means of institutions analogous to the Swiss *Referendum*. See, in the *Revue Bleue*, 25th October, 1890, the article, "Le congrès de Halle et le socialisme allemand". Thus, even German Socialism tends more and more to become opportunist. A Catholic paper of Vienna, organ of the Catholic Socialists, was right in saying some time previous to this: "If the German Socialists succeed in expelling the anarchical elements from their ranks, and get a footing on parliamentary ground, their party will of itself be transformed into a large body, capable of entering within the orbit of the Conservative State". See the *Vaterland*, 10th August, 1890.

The working-class, when they have but a very indirect participation, or none whatever, in political life, are apt to lend a ready ear to whoever speaks to them of revolution and emancipation ; when, on the contrary, by taking part in public life, they see the difficulty of effecting radical economic reforms, they are more easily persuaded of the necessity of certain reforms being brought about by gradual evolution, rather than by a rapid and violent transition.

Thus Switzerland, which, owing to the freedom of its democratic institutions, has been for half a century, and still is, the refuge of the conspirators and revolutionaries of the whole world — Switzerland, which has afforded shelter to Anarchists and Communists, and may be almost considered as the centre of irradiation of the Socialistic movement, has been preserved from all the agitations that disturbed, and still disturb, the States of Europe that stand highest in the scale of civilisation and industry.

It was only from the peace of Aarau, in 1712, that Switzerland, so long troubled by religious dissensions, finally acquired the calm it so much desired. However, Catholics and Protestants still continued their strife, and in 1848 religious ire flamed out anew, and was the principal cause of the Sonderbund War. But from 1848 up to the present day religious discord has not disturbed peace any further, nor given rise to intestine struggles. In Switzerland also, as in England, Germany—everywhere, in fact—though more slowly than in other countries, the Catholics are gaining ground to the detriment of the Protestants. Thus, while half a century ago, to a total population of 1,926,000 inhabitants there were 1,156,000 Protestants and 770,000 Catholics, there are now, to a population of 2,846,000 inhabitants, 1,667,109 Protestants and 1,160,782 Catholics. This proportion clearly shows the slow but sure progress of Catholicism. For while formerly there were 606 Protestants and 390 Catholics to every 1000 inhabitants, there are now 586 Protestants to 408 Catholics.

Obliged to combat the Protestants on the same ground, the Catholic clergy of Switzerland have understood how necessary it is for them not to neglect the social question,

which has forced itself on the attention of men of science and politicians.

As early as 1868, the late Cardinal Mermillod, then Bishop of Hebron, in a spirited sermon preached at Ste. Clotilde's, the 23rd February, and which obtained an immense celebrity, following the example of Monsignor Von Ketteler in Germany, laid the foundation-stone of Catholic Socialism in Switzerland. "Our age beholds the terrible problem of the inequality of conditions rise up before it. There lies the knot of the present difficulties, the enigma proposed to the modern world by ideas and facts. . . . Beyond our present agitations the eye that seeks to discern the truth of things at once perceives that the social question is the last word of all our struggles.[1] . . . Already the camps are forming, and we ask ourselves if the world is to become one great battlefield, or if a treaty of peace will be signed between rich and poor."[2]

What is the actual condition of the working-class? What line of action may the Church adopt? What active part, what duties devolve on the wealthy classes of our day? Behold three questions to which every churchman should seek to find an answer. Doubtless he believes that no one can any longer harbour illusions as to the condition of the modern workman. The workman is condemned to close, incessant labour, that depresses his mind and deters him from being a good Christian or a good father to his family. On the other hand, he feels drawn towards Democratic Socialism by a natural need of dignity and independence, by a legitimate desire for justice. The workman of to-day will have no alms to humiliate him, no patronage to support him; he has his books, his newspapers, his universal relations; he will no longer be cramped by narrow national patriotism, and is fascinated by the magic formulas of Socialism. "Do not accuse me of exaggeration," said Monsignor Mermillod, "it is

[1] See Gareis und Zorn, *Staat und Kirche in der Schweiz.* Zürich, 1877-78.

[2] See the article by G. de Pascal, "La question sociale et l'episcopat". Monsignor Mermillod, in the *Association Catholique*, vol. xxv, p. 1 and following.

of no use averting our eyes from the abyss ; that can neither fill it up nor help us to avoid it. Dangers cannot be warded off by willingly blinding ourselves ; let us, then, examine, without terror or alarm, this state of things, which is the result of the ideas, the habits and the progress of our times. This movement of the working-classes appears to us as a torrent rushing down from the mountains ; it may destroy everything on its passage, and scatter ruin throughout our valleys ; but it must be the honour of the Catholic Church to go forth to meet these forces, and by forming barriers and canals, reduce these imperious billows, and form them, in the nineteenth century, into a mighty and fertilising river."[1]

The Church alone, by her beneficent action, can restore peace among so much hatred and discord. But the higher classes must likewise co-operate to this end ; if, on the contrary, they determine to resist it, they will be overwhelmed by the current. "The first duty of the upper classes is to accept the actual situation as it stands, to see it as it really is, and to study it frankly with the aid of Christian theories." The second duty is the example they must give ; in other words, their loyal and complete acceptatance of Christianity. "What will save us," he goes on to say, "is not a feeble, enervated Christianity, but Christianity sincere and living, which incarnates itself in those virtues that touch the heart of the people, inspiring it with that fortitude which forms its joy and its dignity. We implore you to maintain inviolable fidelity to the Gospel, inasmuch as it is, above all, necessary that the upper classes keep their right to be at the head of society, by showing a good example to those whom it is their duty to guide. What influence, what authority can they hope to exercise over the people if they do not act more wisely than it? How show it the right way if themselves they follow false paths? With what authority counsel it labour and foresight if they pass their own lives in waste and sloth? How can they reproach it with not working on Mondays when they never work all the week long? If we accuse the people of reading bad books, we must not then feed our own minds on unwholesome

[1] See the article by Pascal, as before cited, p. 4.

literature. If we would prohibit it from applauding popular singers, we must, above all, not allow them to be applauded in our own drawing-rooms. We cannot condemn the public amusements of the working-class if at the same time we go to witness the barbarous nudities of the theatres. We have no right to reproach the workman as with a crime if he ruins himself in the wine-shops, while at our fashionable clubs we sacrifice in one night the honour of our family and our children's inheritance!"[1]

De Pascal says that in delivering this sermon at Ste. Clotilde's, Monsignor Mermillod appeared as a visionary; that the elegant and corrupt society of the Second Empire was scandalised by it, and that the bold and loyal words of the Socialist bishop caused surprise and grief in the wealthy *salons* of Paris.[2]

The Gospel, according to Monsignor Mermillod, should not be merely as a mediæval missal in the hands of the clergy, and those who are charged to interpret it should not render themselves the accomplices of social abuses, for it is by no means allowable to have two doctrines, one to protect the refinements of devotion, the other to bless the chains of the poor.

And many years after the address at Ste. Clotilde's, in presenting to the Sovereign Pontiff the representatives of the *Union Catholique d'études sociales et économiques*, the illustrious Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva summed up in a few words his aversion to the actual form of social organisation. "Not only," he said, "does modern law make no account whatever of the laws of the Church, but the ideas that had their origin in these laws have been cancelled from the public spirit; the principles borrowed from the Gospel, and elucidated by the doctors of the Church, especially St. Thomas Aquinas, have been obscured; all just notions on labour and property have been forgotten, denying alike the obligations of the latter and the rights conferred by the former. The struggle for life having now been established as the law of human relations, and labour being considered as a commodity, the existence of

[1] See, likewise, in the above-cited article by Pascal, pp. 5-6.
[2] *Ibid.*

the working people has become subject to the free action of material force, and *they have been reduced to a condition that recalls pagan slavery.* Property, taken only in its egoistic meaning, and isolated from the correlative obligations which give it the necessary counter-balance, has reassumed that absolute character it had in heathen times. Finally, rationalistic economics, by making a distinction between things and their value, gives as basis of the present system of production and exchange, the previous deduction of an interest fixed in virtue of the value as just remuneration of those who, by their activity, have co-operated in the enterprise. Here one evidently sees characteristic traces of usury. Disorder has everywhere reached such a degree that throughout the entire world the social question forms a subject of preoccupation to all. In different countries, on the one hand, individual attempts have been made; on the other, the Governments are persuaded, and daily become more so, of the necessity of their intervention by means of legislation, in order to alleviate the sufferings of the masses. But the evil is too profound to be removed by partial and interested remedies, and your Holiness has already declared it so; and, in affirming once more that the Church alone, in virtue of her high mission, possesses the means of solving all social problems, the Vicar of Jesus Christ has reasserted the divine privilege of his supreme authority: the protection of the weak and the defence of the oppressed. The profound sufferings of the labouring classes threaten to render them accessible to revolutionary instigations, which, besides what is most just in their claims, lead them to expect the satisfaction of all their appetites."[1]

At the Congress of Liége, in 1886, where he declared the necessity of every honest-minded man's facing the social question as he would face fire,[2] Monsignor Mermillod treated

[1] See, in the *Association Catholique*, 15th March, 1888, the address read by Monsignor Mermillod to the Sovereign Pontiff, in presenting to him the leading members of the *Union Catholique d'études sociales et économiques*, 1st February, 1888.

[2] See the article by Georges Renard, "Une alliance entre le Catholicisme et la Democratie," in the *Nouvelle Revue*, p. 808, 15th December, 1888.

the grave problem of State intervention from a thoroughly democratic point of view.

Those who have followed me so far in my investigations will have seen that the first bishops who, with sincerely socialistic tendencies, confronted the study of the social question, sought to have as little recourse as possible to the intervention of the State. Monsignor Von Ketteler, the venerable Archbishop of Mayence, while blaming our economic system and industrial organisation as severely, and frequently with the same violence, as Ferdinand Lassalle, hoped, however, that a radical reform might be brought about through the action of the Church and the free contributions of the faithful, and that the co-operative associations of production, insisted upon by Lassalle, might have been founded without the financial intervention of the State. But when, more advanced in years and discouraged by disappointment, he was forced to renounce these hopes, he also turned his anxious eyes towards the State.

Since Monsignor Ketteler, up to the present, almost all the bishops, who, with large views, if not always with impartiality, have interested themselves in the social question, have come to the same conclusion.

"We must," said Monsignor Mermillod at the Congress of Liége, in 1886, "we must shun two perils: we must not refuse the protection of the State for those who are in need of it, and we must avoid falling into 'statolatry'. There is no necessity for our belonging to the pagan school of Rousseau, nor need we adopt a policy of neutrality which would end by reducing to nothing the duties of public power. And as Christian principles are indispensable, we must not attempt to tread this difficult path unless under their guidance. I recollect having heard the statesman Cavour, who was not much of a Catholic, say to me, in speaking of a law on marriage established in another country: 'I would never accept it, it is not a liberal law; every liberal law should protect the weak, and this law in no way protects woman'. . . . At the present day the workman stands in need of a liberal legislation in this sense; that is, which will protect him

from isolation and against the odious solitude into which he has been cast. Consequently, the State cannot renounce the obligations of its social paternity; neither its duties nor its rights finish on the threshold of the factory or the workshop."

Inspired by similar ideas, Cardinal Mermillod had always, up to the time of his death, defended a programme in reality much resembling that of State Socialism. Born in Switzerland, he had been educated and had lived in a country where, without violence or sudden shocks, democracy had effected the most difficult social reforms; he had not, therefore, nor could he entertain, the same prejudices and the aversion towards democracy and the democratic state as so many Catholics in other countries naturally experience.[1]

But the most eminent of all Catholic Socialists in Switzerland, who, not content with a vain propaganda of theories, has fought the battles of social reform on practical ground, and has had a decisive influence on Swiss legislation and on the Catholic movement throughout Europe, is Gaspard Decurtins, in whom the most daring purpose is joined to rare economic culture and a remarkably elevated mind.

The hatred existing between France and Germany would never have allowed of the Catholics of these two countries coming to any understanding or agreement as to the general lines of their social programme, had they not, greatly owing to the mediation of M. Decurtins, been able to meet and concert their plans on the neutral territory of Switzerland.

Gaspard Decurtins has never refused to ally himself with the Radicals, or to come to an understanding with the Socialists, when his programme, at least in its leading points, agreed with that of either party. "Hunger," he said, at the Congress of Aarau, when the societies of Bern wished to exclude the delegates of the Catholic societies from voting, "hunger is

[1] The three addresses of Cardinal Mermillod, "L'Église et les ouvriers au xix^me^ siècle," 1868; "Second discours sur les ouvriers au xix^me^ siècle," 1868; "La question ouvrière," 1872, are inspired by truly democratic principles. On Cardinal Mermillod, his life and tendencies, see H. de Vaussay, *Monsignor Mermillod*, Paris, 1868; and Prosper Sacy, "Le Cardinal Mermillod," in the *Revue Générale*, April, 1892.

neither Catholic nor Protestant. It is for this reason that whoever comes to assist in solving these questions ought to be welcome, no matter to what religious confession he belong, whether he be of the school of Bakunin or of that of Lassalle, or whether he believe instead in the Gospel of Christ." [1]

It will easily be understood how a Catholic professing such large views, for whom the social question is no pretext for religious propaganda, has gradually ended by winning the confidence even of his adversaries.

Educated in the Monastery of Dissentis, which for several centuries had been the centre of scientific and literary culture in the Grisons, Decurtins, after having completed his studies at Heidelberg, where he took his doctor's degree, returned to his native district. Almost immediately on his return he was elected *Landamman*. He was an uncompromising Catholic, but being little fitted for metaphysical discussions, and understanding at once the immense social power of Catholicism, he devoted his efforts to the social question. As he was averse to the "Old Catholics," who rejected papal infallibility, he soon became leader of the young Ultramontane party. When attempts were made in Switzerland to abolish the last remnant of collective property, which allowed the poor free right of pasturage for their goats and cows in the meadows belonging to the Commune, and even in those of private individuals,[2] he rose up against these measures, and was able to preserve for the poor peasantry their time-honoured Collectivist custom.

Shortly after he succeeded in passing his bill on accidents incurred by workmen while at labour; it was accompanied by a report in which, at that early date, he already formulated his social programme. The workman, according to Decurtins, has, like every man, a right to existence; consequently, his labour ought to bring him in, not only what is strictly neces-

[1] See the article by Renard already cited, p. 810. On Decurtins and the Catholic Socialist movement in Switzerland see the excellent article by F. Pictet, in the *Bibliothèque Universelle*, May-June, 1892.

[2] See Emile de Laveleye, *De la propriété collective*, chapters xviii., xix. Paris, 1877.

sary to live on from day to day, but should also assure him against the risk of being killed or crippled, and thus deprived of his strength, which forms his whole capital. Now, his wage, according to the famous "iron law" of Lassalle, barely suffices to procure him the strictest necessaries for subsistence. Hence the law should oblige the master to assure him a minimum wage that may serve him as a guarantee against the dangers to which he is exposed in the exercise of his trade, or an indemnity which in all cases of accident may serve as a compensation for the immoral insufficiency of his daily remuneration.[1]

As early as 1885, when the Catholic Socialist party in Switzerland was still at its first essays, Gaspard Decurtins, in a motion in which he invited the Federal Council to make an accurate examination of the law on the civil responsibility of masters, traced the first lines of his programme. "It is necessary," he said, in presenting his motion, "that the workman should find in his wage an equivalent to the risk he runs. With the excessive production, which is now become general and almost constant, wages have gone down to the minimum, and frequently do not represent more than what is absolutely necessary to prevent starvation. This is the terrible 'iron law' spoken of by Lassalle. The average wage is just sufficient to permit the working-class to vegetate and continue the species. It can never rise because of the excess of production, nor can it get any lower, for in that case mortality would soon see to diminishing the number of available arms. The State is bound to interfere, and to correct the brutality of the economic laws. The workman has a right to existence like every other man. This is a principle of natural law, which the State cannot deny without injuring itself, which it cannot deny if it would maintain the noble ideals of justice. It is necessary that the workman's minimum wage should render possible three things: the satisfying of the demands of nature; compensation for the risks of death or mutilation to which he

[1] See Gaspard Decurtins, *Les catholiques et la question sociale*, p. 5. Fribourg, 1890.

is exposed in the service of his master; and, finally, compensation for the normal and regular utilising of his strength."[1]

The better to defend the rights of labour, Decurtins, in concert with the Socialists, brought about the adoption of the *Sécrétariat Ouvrier*, an institution, nothing equivalent to which exists in the other countries of Europe. The *Sécrétariat Ouvrier* is an office of statistics which serves as intermediary between the Government and the labouring masses. The officials of the *Sécrétariat*, though paid by the confederation, are, however, named by the representatives of the working-men's societies; they can, in consequence, maintain a resolute and independent line of conduct towards the Government and industrialists. The *Sécrétariat Ouvrier* is charged with presenting to Government the complaints of the workmen by whom it is elected, and their accusations against the public functionaries charged with the application of the industrial laws. Besides this, it supplies the workmen with any information they may require.[2]

Decurtins was not content with obtaining reforms at home. Like all those who believe in the efficacy of State regulation of labour, he saw that a country which seeks to protect by social laws the economic capacity of its workers, must necessarily find itself at a disadvantage on the international markets with other countries in which the State does not intervene, or limits its action to a very narrow sphere.

The idea of an international conference for the regulation of labour, or, rather, to establish international conventions in favour of the workers, which was first advanced almost half a century ago by an Alsatian manufacturer, Daniel Legrand, had met with supporters in Switzerland. In 1881, at the initiative of Colonel Frei of Basle, Switzerland had invited the leading industrial countries of Europe to come to an accord on the fundamental prescriptions of the labour laws. The thing fell through, however, especially on account of the opposition

[1] See Pictet, article already cited.

[2] On the history, aims and results of the *Sécrétariat Ouvrier* in Switzerland, see the two articles in the *Economista* of Florence, 31st August and 28th September, 1890

offered by Germany, which in 1881 declared that the internal laws of each State sufficed for the regulation of such matters, and that it was, consequently, unnecessary to be bound by international treaties.[1]

Decurtins tried to take up Colonel Frei's proposal, but with the assistance of the Catholics only he would have found it difficult to win the day. He then had recourse to the aid of the Radicals. The deputy Favon, director of the Radical paper, *Le Génévois*, and formerly president of the Federal Council, accepted the proposal of Decurtins, and their concerted action rendered the victory easy. The more advanced among the Radicals, who had always kept aloof from the Catholics, were scandalised at this proceeding. But the young Radical party, seeing that their programme of economic reform corresponded for the most part with that of the Catholics, pressed them into the alliance. Moreover, they feared being beaten by the Conservative Liberals, and the adhesion of the Catholics was a boon to them. "I know well," said Favon, when explaining at the Federal Council his union with the leader of the young Catholic party, "I know well that Decurtins and I do not wish for the same form of society. He hopes that the social question will be solved to the advantage of the Catholic Church; I, instead, think that it will be solved in favour of free thought. But what matter? Let us put off our quarrel, and begin by rendering the condition of society better, more united, more regulated; then, in this improved society, we shall come forward with our hopes and convictions. 'If they are roses they will bloom,' says the Italian proverb And between us, the victory will fall to the share of him who has succeeded in raising to the highest possible standard of worth and excellence the tribunal that is to judge him."[2]

The Federal Council, accepting the proposal of Decurtins,

[1] For the history of these negotiations, see Numa Droz, "La législation internationale du travail," in the *Bibliothèque universelle et revue suisse*, pp. 242, 243, February, 1889; E. Cavalieri, "I rescritti socialisti dell' imperatore di Germania," in the *Nuova Antologia*, p. 704, etc., 16th August, 1889.

[2] See Renard, *Une alliance*, etc., p. 804.

convoked a conference at Bern, but it was not held, and was, for political reasons, replaced by that of Berlin.[1]

According to Decurtins, the extending of the legislation for the protection of the working-class throughout the different countries of Europe is no emanation of abstract theories and philanthropic good wishes, but the necessary consequence of the condition of modern production.[2]

Modern industrialism has caused almost similar effects in all nations, whatever may be their race, language, or degree of intellectual culture. The excessive protraction of the day's work, the factory labour of women and children, are in close connection with the development of mechanical industry. The reason of the great difference between hand labour and machine labour lies in the fact that the first demands physical strength and a certain technical ability, which, in machine labour, are replaced by elementary forces and the functions with which the mechanical engineer has endowed the machine. In machine labour, even a feeble child or an inexpert girl may consequently produce work much superior to that produced by the hand labour of a strong man, whose abilities have been developed by long and constant exercise. Therefore, the man in the full vigour of his strength is very frequently replaced by a woman, and while formerly the workman was able to earn a wage sufficient to provide for the maintenance of the whole family, women and children have now become his competitors. And although the collective wage of a family is now not unfrequently superior to that formerly earned by the father alone,

[1] On the causes of the Conference of Bern not taking place see the *Green Book* presented by Signor Crispi in the Chamber of Deputies, 7th June, 1890, document 32. The Conference of Bern had, however, included in its programme the determination of the duration of the maximum working day.

[2] Decurtins has given a brilliant demonstration of this argument in his elaborate memorial on *La question de la protection ouvrière internationale*, Bern, S. Colin, 1889, and in his noteworthy address, delivered at the Federal Council, and published by the *Association Catholique*, pp. 310-325, 15th September, 1888. The same address was also published in Italy by the clerical paper, *La Lega Lombarda*, in the numbers of the 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th July. 1888.

the organism of the family, through the employment of the women and children in factory work, loses its moral force, while its unity is weakened. Wherever industry has been allowed to exploit the workman freely, it has been observed that the working population degenerate morally and physically, while losing at the same time part of their economic capacity. The end of the machine is to increase production, and the excessive increase has entailed the necessary consequence of the depreciation of produce. The industrialist naturally seeks compensation in an increase of circulation, and, having anticipated for the purchase of the machine capital which must be made to render the highest interest possible, his aim is to make the machine work the most rapidly and for the longest duration of time he can. Besides this, machinery is subject to rapid and continual improvements. A disastrous interpretation of liberty has, up to the present, withheld the State from entering into these questions, and the State finally determines to intervene only when constrained to do so by the view of evils and misery such that no optimist dare deny them.

There cannot, therefore, exist any doubt but that the State must interfere in defence of women and children, no doubt but that it can and must fix the number of hours of the maximum working day for adults, and that to all workers the weekly day of rest must be assured. Those who repudiate all State intervention base their argument upon a fundamental error. The object of labour contracts is not only a certain quantity of labour, but rather the capacity of labour, consequently the whole man. It is simply mockery to say that the workman is free in making his contracts. Can the alternative between the low price offered him by the master and the danger of dying of starvation be called freedom?

On the other hand, the necessity of international legislation on labour is evident. Everywhere industrialism has assumed the same characteristics, the same aspect. It is, indeed, as a moving stream without banks. The workman who cannot find work in Switzerland or in Belgium now passes without any difficulty into Germany or England. Thus the

production of one country influences the market of another, and it is by no means indifferent to two nations to know in what manner production is regulated in each other. In view of the daily increase of production, the legislator ought to make provisions as to wages, the protection of workmen, etc.; in other words, to lay the masters under serious obligations. If these measures are adopted by one State alone each manufacturer is inclined to consider them unjust, as they place him in an unfavourable position with regard to foreign competition. Hence it is that international conventions become the *conditio sine quâ non* of the general development of the labour law.

Basing itself upon the proposals of Decurtins and Favon, the Swiss Government determined to invite the industrialist States of Europe to the conference to be held at Bern, which led to that of Berlin, the results of which, such as they have been, leave no room for doubt, and which had, and still have, great influence on the social legislation movement.

"Towards the end of the last century," said Decurtins at the Catholic Congress at Freiburg, in Breisgau, "a spirit arose, hostile to the Cross, while a distressing system of philosophy seemed to seek for welfare only in the negation of all things. This philosophy invaded even economic ground, where it cast the motto: *Laissez-faire, laissez-passer*, which means, let each one act just as he chooses, and everything may go on as best it can. This doctrine was decidedly the outcome of that cold, heartless current of thought to which the venom of Jansenism had opened the way, and in which Voltaire and Rousseau celebrated their triumph. And how were the fallacious hopes of those high-flown apostles of liberty realised? To-day, after a century, we are reaping a harvest that is the fruit of their principles. We are assisting at a savage struggle of interests, where, as at the passage of the Beresina, only the boldest horseman succeeds, but where thousands upon thousands of men perish miserably under the horse's hoofs. It is a fearful struggle for existence; the men of the French Revolution have, in this respect, surpassed Darwin and his doctrines."[1]

[1] See the address delivered by Decurtins at Freiburg, published by the *Libertà* of Bellinzona, 19th October, 1888.

By the bill passed the 23rd March, 1877, Switzerland fixed the limits of the maximum working day, after having, by another law, already guaranteed the workman against accidents, and provided for the protection of women and children occupied in factories. The Catholics having, together with the Radicals, obtained the institution of the *Sécrétariat Ouvrier*, now demanded the extension of the councils of *prud' hommes*, the organisation of compulsory insurance against sickness and accidents, etc. Nor is this alliance of Catholics and Radicals on the field of social reforms merely apparent; the young Ultramontane party, led by Decurtins, very frequently acts in concert with advanced Radicals, and the *Basler Volksblatt*, the organ of the young and uncompromising Ultramontane party, is not rarely in harmony with the moderate Socialist papers.[1]

Gaspard Decurtins, who is little more than thirty-five years of age, is decidedly the most popular man in Catholic Switzerland. "Imagine to yourself," says one of his biographers, "a tall, broad-shouldered man, of simple manners and bold, resolute carriage, with a mass of fair hair, thick fair moustache, and two great blue eyes that remind you of the traditional type of the ancient Gauls.[2] Add to all that a warm, sonorous voice, flowing and passionate language that rushes on like a torrent; the very incarnation of a tribune and popular speaker. He belongs to a good Swiss family, but has nothing affected, studied, or haughty about him; great natural cordiality that wins your sympathy at once. There is never a peasant wedding nor village festival at which he does not assist and speak. Not only has he a predilection for the lowly, he loves them and frequents them."[3]

Decurtins can now count not only upon the support of the Catholics, but upon that of a great part of the Swiss working-class, to whatever party they belong and whatever religion they profess. Instead of opposing the *Arbeiterbund*, that

[1] See Renard, *Une alliance*, etc., pp. 806 and 807.

[2] [More probably Franks; M. Decurtins is of the "Siegfried" type.—Trans.]

[3] See Renard, as above.

powerful association of Swiss workmen, which constitutes a State within the State, Decurtins has always defended it, and has provoked in it the fusion of Catholic and Protestant workmen. He has, moreover, won the adhesion of Curti, one of the most noted Democratic leaders of Switzerland, and the support of the *Grütlianer* labour party, which disposes of thousands of workmen.

Besides the approval of the late Cardinal Manning, and of many dignitaries of the Catholic Church, Decurtins has also received warm encouragement from the Sovereign Pontiff.

According to a famous letter addressed to him in the name of the Pope by Monsignor Jacobini, civil law has the duty and the right of protecting childhood, in order that its strength be not prematurely wasted, nor its innocence exposed to peril; of preventing the health of women and mothers of families from being injured and destroyed by factory-work; of protecting adults, so that the duration of their daily work be not prolonged beyond certain limits; and of guaranteeing in every way possible the Sunday's rest.[1]

[1] I here give this important letter of Monsignor Jacobini in its entirety:—

Illustrissime Domine, quas ad Sanctissimum D. N. Leonem XIII. nuper misisti litteras, eae per me ad Ipsum relatae sunt paucis abhinc diebus. Enimvero exinde non mediocrem delectationem cepit Sanctitas Sua: quod studia laboresque tuos in fœderali Helvetiæ concilio cumulatos felici exitu intellegerit, ut nationum rectores in cœtum cogerentur ommuni in Europa lege causæ operariorum hominum et patrocinio prospecturi.

Itaque concilium tuum inprimis laudavit, quo nihil esse potest nobilius, nihil sanctius. Tueri enim puerilem ætatem, ne eius vires præmaturis laboribus intempestive obsumantur, innocentia periculetur; matresfamilias domui officioque suo restituere, ne officinis addictæ naturali suo munere sese abdicent: ipsos operarios homines protegere ne pensum diei ad plures quam par est horas protrahatur: denique dierum festorum requiem, sanctitatemque a Deo ipso sancitam, lege civili communire: hæc quidem ea sunt, ut et christianæ religionis præceptis, ipsaque humanitatis lege plane jubeantur, opportunumque in iis remedium pateat lethiferæ pesti per intimos humanæ societatis artus serpenti propulsandæ.

Quapropter operosam sedulitatem tuam curasque efficaces plane orobat, teque in propositis confirmat, hortaturque ut pauperum ac debilium

Faithful to his principles and tendencies, though opposed to the revolutionary proceedings of Democratic Socialism, Decurtins was the first to protest against the expulsion of the German Socialists from Swiss territory.

He is neither a visionary nor a dupe, but a thoroughly practical man, who ignores neither the difficulties of the question he treats, the hardships of real life, nor the profound contrasts existing between real life and scientific theory.

Beside the practical and legalitarian Socialism of Decurtins there is also among the Catholics a small party of philanthropic or sentimental Socialists, who, while they deplore and criticise as anti-Christian the present state of society, have nothing to oppose to it beyond nebulous statements and transcendental yearnings.

M. Théodore de la Rive, a Protestant converted to Catholicism, and a sincere admirer of Decurtins, in a conference on *The Social Danger*, held at Geneva, 17th March, 1889, spoke with really Socialistic perception of the evils that afflict the organism of modern society ; but, in a second conference held a week later, in seeking to point out the remedies, he limited himself to saying that a sound and efficacious legislation for the working classes will never be possible until they are penetrated with a Christian spirit.

"All Europe," says De la Rive, "was touched at the thought of African slavery, and has sought to prevent it by every possible means. But Europe, like Africa, is also full of slaves, inasmuch as we have the slaves of labour, of the workshop and the factories. We also have slaves who serve the wants, the pleasures, and the vices of others. This, of a truth, is the evil that afflicts us, the danger we fear, the painful

patrocinium strenue agas quorum tutelam exemplo Auctoris sui suffulta semper catholica Ecclesia suscepit arcteque tenuit. Cælestium denique munerum auspicem, suæque benevolentiæ testem Apostolicam Benedictionem Tibi cæptisque tuis benigne impertitus est.

Ego vero Dominationi tuæ fausta omnia libentissime a Deo adprecor.

Addictissimus,

✠ D. Archiep. Tyr.

Romæ, die 1° Maii, 1889.

sore that corrodes society ever deeper. On the one hand, among the working classes, an excess of want and misery; on the other, among the wealthy classes, an excess of enjoyments, of useless luxury, and of pleasures. On the one hand, the poor, who are dying of hunger; on the other, the rich, whose cooks are at their wits' end to invent some ingenious recipe that may excite their flagging appetite. On one side, men and women who struggle and suffer, injuring their health by close application to the same labour during twelve months in the year, ever in the same place, suffering from the severity of winter and the excessive heat of summer; on the other side, men and women who complacently follow every caprice of their fancy, who fly from the first cold winds and take refuge in the south, and who from the heat of July repair to the mountains, men who waste their strength all through the winter in the close air of theatres and ball-rooms, and who go to recruit in the summer, continuing the same round of pleasure in villas and at watering places.

"For the first all is difficult and trying, for the second all is agreeable and easy. They even ignore labour. As Figaro says, they merely took the trouble of being born, nothing more. Ah! you rich, you useless rich! look to what you are doing; think of those eager eyes that observe you, and of the account that one day you must render. Remember the words of a venerable bishop, who was no doubt severe, perhaps even importune, but just in the main, in his out-spoken brutality: 'If the rich do not work, *they steal*, since they were paid in advance'."[1]

"We agree with the Democratic school," said Dr. Feigenwinter, at the Catholic Congress of Basle in 1877, "in con-

[1] Th. de la Rive, *Le péril social et le devoir actuel, le mal, le remède*, pp. 55-57; Geneva, H. Trembley, 1889. See also the lectures given by De la Rive on "Trois erreurs et trois vérités," "Le devoir des hommes de cœur," "La question sociale," "Trois essais de religions modernes," "Les deux armées," etc., published by H. Trembley, Geneva. De la Rive is rather what may be termed a sentimental Socialist, but as an author he is gifted with much power and lucidity, and possesses in the highest degree uncommon fertility of imagination, joined to a rare elegance of style.

demning the present social condition." What does it matter if the Catholics are called Socialists? Have not Protestant theologians reproached St. Thomas Aquinas and Gratian with being Socialists? Was even St. Ambrose spared a similar accusation? If Catholics can accept the fundamental theories of Socialism, though not its mode of proceeding, they cannot, without being in contradiction with themselves, accept the theories of economic Liberalism. One of the leaders of the Liberal school, Professor Treitschke of Berlin, said that social misery should be considered as the aliment of civilisation. Is not that infamous? Is it not contrary to the teachings of the Church?

The actual conditions of labour are unjust. Wages are not in proportion to the work produced, and as civilisation progresses the workman's position becomes every day more precarious. The rate of interest is based upon iniquitous principles, inasmuch as the farmer, whose land yields him two or three per cent., has to pay five per cent. on mortgage. Consequently the peasant, once all his capital is eaten up to pay his debts, goes to seek a livelihood in the cities, thus daily adding to the already numerous class of proletarians. Now, Catholics and Socialists, each in their own way, feel it their duty to place a check on these evils, which press so heavily on our present society.[1]

The Swiss bishops assembled at Baden, September, 1887, were unanimous in voting a resolution inviting the clergy to proceed to the foundation of labour associations. In all the Catholic districts of the Confederation Catholic working-men's societies were rapidly formed one after another, and the following year the Congress of the Catholic Labour Associations met at Baden, 3rd December, 1888, and decided to re-unite them all in one sole group, under one direction. Zürich was chosen as the central seat, and on the 3rd February, 1889, the delegates of all the Catholic associations, in concert with the

[1] See the *Pays* of Porrentruy, 29th September, and the *Association Catholique*, p. 591, 15th November, 1877. On the organisation of the Swiss Catholics and their associations and press, see Pictet, article cited above.

other labour associations, named the central committee. The committee, which included many eminent men, such as Conrad of Aargau, Python of Fribourg, and a number of priests, deputies, journalists, and writers, was formed, however, for the most part, of workmen.[1] It stated the tendencies of the association in a manifesto addressed to the Catholics. "What are the aims of the association? The study and discussion of the gravest and most ardent questions of the day; it wishes that the Catholics of Switzerland be not only tolerated, but that they enjoy the same rights as all the other members of the Confederation; that all the Catholics of Switzerland unite into one strong Conservative party, always ready to fight the battles of truth and of right. Finally, and *above all*, it intends to consecrate all its attention to the vital question of the day, the social question, to the solution of which it purposes to direct all its efforts. For who ignores the misery of the working people? Who does not hear their cries of sorrow?"[2]

The Catholics have made another great stride in advance by founding the Catholic University of Fribourg. M. Decurtins succeeded, with the assistance of M. Python, in collecting the funds necessary for this vast undertaking, and the university now works pretty well since a few years back. Many of the professors are persons of real worth, and the chair of political economy has been entrusted to the learned Dominican, Father Weiss, who is one of the warmest pioneers of Catholic Socialism.[3]

The Swiss Catholic Socialists have shown much less hesitation in embracing the doctrines of State Socialism than their friends in France and Germany. Of a truth, in a country which

[1] See the *Association Catholique*, vol. xxiii., p. 666, and vol. xxvii., p. 336.

[2] See the *Association Catholique* as above.

[3] See in the *Nouvelle Revue*, September, 1890, the article by Georges Renard, "Deux nouvelles Universités suisses". On the studies that are conducted in the new university see the *Index lectionum quæ in universitate friburgensi per menses æstivas anni MDCCCXCI. inde a die XV. aprilis habebuntur*, Fribourg, 1891; Pictet, article cited.

is largely representative, and where several of the cantons governments are entirely Catholic, and the whole party in admirable discipline, the Catholics have little or nothing to fear on the part of the State, and are consequently much less prejudiced against it than the Catholics of other nations, in which the Government, being free from the influence of local democratic institutions, may cause many and serious inconveniences.[1]

Thus, the few Catholics assembled at Olten, during the month of April, 1890, in concert with the representatives of the Radical associations, demanded strict regulation of labour on the part of the State, such as would in reality surpass the desires of the most advanced State Socialists. The congress, presided over by Schener, a Radical, and composed for the most part of Radical associations, was attended by only four representatives of Catholic associations, one of whom was Gaspard Decurtins, the leader of the entire Swiss Ultramontane movement.

And without the slightest hesitation the Catholics accepted the proposals and resolutions of the Radicals. The four reporters of the congress, Curti, Grenlich, Cornaz, and Decurtins, though of entirely opposite political opinions, agreed without any difficulty on the question of social reforms. The assembly was unanimous in recognising the necessity of compulsory insurance in case of sickness and accidents. On the report of Grenlich it voted the institution of trades unions, labour societies, and industrial societies, with special corporative rights, and admitted the necessity of declaring obligatory for all the workmen of the same trade the regulations and provisions fixed on by common consent of masters and workmen. It passed the motion brought forward by Decurtins and Schener on the reform of the factory laws, which, according to the vote of the congress, should apply also to small workshops employing three workmen, with home supervision of the

[1] Among the Swiss Catholics there is also a party which openly accepts the doctrines and theories of liberal economy. The principal representative of this party is M. Segesser. See Pictet, article cited.

industrial labour of children. It further fixed the normal working day at ten hours.[1]

Union with the more advanced parties, which forms a great obstacle to the Catholics of other countries, has not proved a difficulty for Swiss Catholics. On the question of economic reforms, Catholics and Democrats have been able to harmonise without there being any need of the former failing in obedience to the canons of their faith, or of the latter denying their principles. And in this free country, in which the various parties are constantly contesting for the government of each canton, and where, by necessity of warfare, they know each other intimately, the union has been possible, and has taken place sooner than elsewhere.

[1] See, on the congress at Olten and the part taken in it by G. Decurtins, the "Chronique," by Charles Gide, in the *Revue d'économie politique*, pp. 315, 316, May-June, 1890; the *Association Catholique*, pp. 615, 617, 15th May, 1890; H. de Moly, "La réglementation du travail en France et les catholiques," in the *Réforme Sociale*, p. 591, 10th May, 1890; and the article by Georges Michel, "Le socialisme Chrétien," in the *Économiste Français*, pp. 517-519, 26th April, 1890. Michel, however, commits a number of mistakes; he thinks the Congress of Olten was entirely composed of Catholics, on whom he expresses most erroneous opinions.

CHAPTER X.

CATHOLIC SOCIALISM IN FRANCE AND BELGIUM.

Origins and Tendencies of French Socialism—Its Character and Evolution—Influence of Marx and of German Socialism—Possibilists and Impossibilists—The Catholic Movement—Catholic Liberalism—Catholic Socialism—The Two Currents among French Catholic Socialists—Charles Périn—The Le Play School—Claude Jannet—Father Ludovic de Besse and Liberal Economics—Catholic Socialists—*L'Œuvre des Cercles Catholiques d'Ouvriers* and its Tendencies—*L'Œuvre* and the Socialists—Origin, History, and Programme of the *Œuvre*—Count de Mun—Criticism of Liberal Economics—The Guild System—Effects of Liberty according to De Mun—De Mun and Socialism—De Mun's Action—De Mun's Bill and the Catholic Socialists of the French Chamber—Protection and Regulation of Labour—Marquis de La Tour du Pin Chambly—Compulsory Guilds and Christian Economy—Social Programme of La Tour du Pin—*Le Parlementarisme, voilà l'Ennemi!*—Ségur-Lamoignon—Criticism of Capitalism and Industrialism—Capitalism and Social Dissolution—G. de Pascal—Roquefeuil—Bréda—Diffusion of the *Œuvre*—The Defenders of the Free Guilds—Léon Harmel—Practical Attempts at Val-des-Bois—Organisation and History of a Christian Corporation—The Catholic Industrialists of the North—French Catholic Jurisconsults and their Conservative Programme—Catholic Socialism in Belgium—François Huet and the Social Reign of Christianity—Huet's Collectivism—Influence of Périn—Organisation of Belgian Catholics—Monseigneur Dontcloux—Abbé Pottier and the Claims of Labour—Moderation of the Belgian Catholics—Action of Catholic Governments.

FRANCE is the country of Europe in which the doctrines of modern Socialism first obtained a wide diffusion among the people. Though in Germany, previous to 1848, a few isolated thinkers, like Rodbertus Jageztow, or original philosophers, like Fichte, or more or less daring economists, like Michael or Engels, maintained doctrines having much affinity with those of modern Socialism, Germany was not disturbed by socialistic agitations till long after 1848, when the people, having obtained civil equality, and roused by the active propa-

ganda of Ferdinand Lassalle, aimed at securing political power as well.

But although Democratic Socialism in France was the cause of considerable evils, and the agitations of the French Socialists have very frequently assumed a violent and revolutionary character, French Socialism at its beginning had not these tendencies, which it only acquired through the slow and fatal infiltration of German Socialism.

Setting aside Caius Gracchus Babœuf, whose criminal dreams and projects met with but a relatively small number of adherents, the founders of French Socialism were not revolutionaries. Pecqueur demanded the nationalisation of the land and of industry by means of progressive reforms; Saint-Simon, the unwitting apostle of bourgeois Socialism, extolled the popularisation of credit and the suppression of inheritance; Fourier wanted "guarantees" and phalansteries; Proudhon limited the greater part of his aspirations to gratuitous credit and the people's bank; Blanqui, a true Possibilist, was willing to content himself with gradual and progressive reforms, and, indeed, took much more interest in political than in economic questions.

Without attempting to deny the evil influence exercised on French Socialism by the Collectivist theories of Germany, and before that by those of Bakunin, we must, however, admit that the Commune was much more the result of special causes than of Socialistic ideas. The city had for several months been suffering from famine, and was in a state of the greatest fermentation. Betrayed by its chiefs, abandoned to itself, Paris inevitably fell into the excesses of the Commune.[1]

Besides, the violent Socialistic agitations so frequent in France, are less the fault of the Socialist writers than of the fatal heritage left to the people by the Revolution of 1789. According to the unfortunate popular idea, a revolution can overthrow a social *régime*, the result of an historic inheritance many centuries old, to create a new one based on more or less Utopian and extravagant aspirations. This fatal preconcep-

[1] See Camille Pelletan, *De* 1815 *à nos jours*, pp. 298-320. Paris, 1892.

tion, which forms the great danger for the future of France, and has, for the last century, been the cause of a great part of its troubles, has helped for many years to give an odious and turbulent character to French Socialism.

In the violent language of the French Socialists, up to about ten or twelve years ago, the word God was synonymous with tyrant; priest, with vampire; and at public meetings and in the papers used for purposes of propaganda the refrain was always: "Death to the bourgeois!" "God means evil," said Proudhon; "we may say the same thing of Fatherland."[1] "What is property? A word void of sense which we must abolish."[2]

None of the English or German Socialists ever expressed themselves in like manner; this strange violence of language is a sad prerogative of the Socialists of Latin race.

Nevertheless, within the last twelve years, French Socialism has undergone a very rapid evolution in a conservative sense. In 1880 the chiefs of the Marxist party were the almost undisputed leaders of the Socialists' ranks. Guesde, Deville, and Lafargue, who directed the labours of the congress held that year at Havre, insisted upon the necessity of the *action révolutionnaire* being accepted, and imposed *das Kapital* of Marx as the gospel of the party.

But the Possibilist current, disgusted by the violence and excesses of the Revolutionary Socialist party, continued gaining ground with wonderful rapidity, and in 1882, at the congress at St. Étienne, the Possibilists, headed by Benoît Malon, already formed a very large majority. The Marxists tried in in vain to resist, and in the last violent affray tried equally in vain to form obstruction; they not only found no favour with the majority, but were ultimately expelled from the assembly. When the Marxists hurled themselves against the majority, accusing it of "Possibilism," the latter replied: "Oui nous sommes des possibilistes, et vous êtes des impossibilistes". Yes, we are Possibilists, and you are Impossibilists.

Almost about the same time Benoît Malon, writing in the

[1] See the review, *La question sociale*, p. 76; March-April, 1888.
[2] *Ibid*, p. 113; April-May, 1889.

Revue Socialiste, one of the most serious and scientific reviews of French Socialism, began to suppress the word *Revolution*, substituting for it *crise d'évolution*. And in the same review, in some articles of considerable importance, E. Rouanet demonstrated that the programme of German Socialistic Democracy is incompatible with the tendencies and wants of the French working classes.

Thus, the title *Parti ouvrier socialiste-révolutionnaire* was replaced by *Fédération des travailleurs socialistes de France.*

The dissensions between Possibilists and Marxists became more and more accentuated, and in 1888, at the ninth congress, the latter, who formed but a small minority, barely succeeded in having a few of their proposals adopted. And while there are but four Marxists in the French Chamber, the number of Possibilists is forty-three.[1]

Besides, it is very easy to understand how, in a naturally rich country, where the condition of the working-class is better than in almost any other part of Europe, and in which property is much sub-divided, and the people have enjoyed electoral rights for a number of years, that in spite of the superficial and violent character of the masses social conflicts must necessarily be much less intense and less dangerous than in Germany.

It is already forty years since the problem of the attitude the Church ought to assume with regard to the new claims of labour presented itself to the minds of French Socialists. In 1852 Blanqui wrote: "There exist certain questions in political economy, such as the equitable distribution of the produce of labour, and many other problems,[2] which must remain unsolved till religion takes them up". And long before him, Proudhon had written: "It is particularly the duty of the clergy to arouse the dormant spirits; let the priests, then, take up the noble mission thus offered them. The social question is already raised, but it is wavering, like a theory without principle; you must become masters of it, studying it in all its

[1] See the study by Édourd Fontaine, "L'évolution du socialisme français," in the *Revue Bleue*, 6th September, 1890.

[2] Blanqui, *Histoire de l'économie politique*, vol. i., p. 152. Paris, 1852.

reality. Once preached in the name of God, and consecrated by the voice of the priest, it will strike root with the rapidity of lightning." [1]

The Liberal movement among French Catholics, awakened by Lamennais, and kept alive by Lacordaire and Montalembert, which was afterwards condemned by Gregory XVI., in his celebrated encyclical letter, *Mirari vos*, had, since 1840, aroused in the clergy and the Catholic society of France the desire to reconcile the tendencies and traditions of the Church with the aspirations of modern society.[2]

Despite the opposition of the Ultramontanes, this desire has but kept increasing, owing principally to the participation of the clergy in political life, and to the new requirements of the Church. And when Socialism discarded a great part of its primitive revolutionary tendencies, the more intelligent and cultured and intrepid among the French Catholics felt the necessity of interesting themselves in the social question.[3]

But if in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland the historic traditions, the condition of the Church, and the political institutions have urged a large number of the clergy to accept the doctrines of State Socialism, and not infrequently to overstep

[1] See A. Pottier, *Ce qu'il y a de légitime dans les révendications ouvrières*, p. 2, report presented at the Congress of Liége, September, 1890. However, Proudhon, in *L'Église et la révolution*, showed how these two principles were irreconcilable.

[2] See, on the Catholic Liberal movement, Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu, *Les Catholiques libéraux; l'Église et le libéralisme de* 1830 *à nos jours*, chaps. v., vi. and vii. Paris: Plon, 1885.

[3] See Paul Ribot, *Du rôle social des idées chrétiennes*, Paris, Plon, 1879; and F. Lorrain, *Le problème de la France contemporaine*, Paris, Plon, 1879. More than thirty years ago several French Catholic Economists had already sought to reconcile the tendencies of modern economics with the dogmas of the Church. See Abbé Corbière, *L'économie sociale au point de vue chrétien*, Paris, Jouby, 1863; and Ch. Le Lièvre, *Exposé de principes économiques de la société chrétienne*, Paris, 1850; *Le travail et le prêt et l'intérêt*, Paris, Guillaumin, 1865; *La science et la foi*, Paris, Guillaumin, 1863; *L'travail et l'association*, Paris, Guillaumin, 1865. In his last book, *Le travail et l'usure dans l'antiquité*, p. 3, Paris, 1866, Le Lièvre went the length of maintaining that even he "qui prête à un taux aussi minime qu'il soit" is guilty of usury.

them, the French clergy have beheld with distrust the excessive and constant development of State power.

Thus, the French Catholics who interest themselves in the social question may be divided into two large schools: the first treads in the footsteps of Périn and Le Play, has more or less confidence in economic liberty, limits as much as possible the intervention of the State, and does not believe in the necessity of returning to the old corporative system; the second school, instead, follows very closely the theories propounded by Hitze and Ratzinger in Germany, and by Vogelsang in Austria.[1]

The first of the two schools is anything but Socialistic. Indeed, the disciples of M. Le Play believe, with their master, that the State ought to confine its activity within a very limited orbit, and that economic liberty is the sole means which should in all cases be employed towards the realisation of the general good.[2]

M. Charles Périn, who was for many years professor at the Belgian University of Louvain, is still the Catholic Socialist writer who enjoys the largest credit among French Catholics.

According to Périn, a radical reform of the Christian social order is both necessary and urgent.[3] But, while labouring for this reform of the future, we must not forget urgent measures of preservation and purely economic reforms, by means of which we may hope to arrest the evil in its progress. And, above all, we must lay aside the absolute doctrine of *laissez-faire*. "The intervention of the State is by common consent indispensable for the repression of evil; but it may also, in some cases, be indispensable for the prevention of evil, or to

[1] See the "Chronique," by Gide, in the *Revue d'économie politique*, p. 332, May-June, 1889.

[2] Claude Jannet, *L'organisation du travail d'après F. Le Play et le mouvement social contemporain*, p. 28, Paris, 1890. On the social ideas of Le Play see, likewise, Ribot, *Exposé critique des doctrines sociales de M. Le Play*, Paris, Plon; and Moreau d'Andoy, "Monsieur Le Play et la réforme sociale," in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, vol. xxxiv., p. 248 and following, 1872.

[3] Ch. Périn, "Le droit nouveau en matière économique," taken from the *Revue catholique des institutions et du droit*, p. 2.

assure the efficacy and stability of the institutions destined to unite the workers of all classes, organising and fortifying them against the risks and misfortunes of industrial life."[1]

All the claims of the labour democracy are not to be repudiated in a mass. Some of them may be justified by general reasons of protection; none, on the contrary, can be justified in the name of the master's obligation towards the workman, consequent on the hire of his labour. The Socialistic principle of compulsory insurance of the workman ought to be excluded. Nor is the principle which introduces charity into the domain of justice less injurious. We must, consequently, avoid not only Democratic Socialism, but likewise State Socialism, inasmuch as "nothing is more opposed to every species of Socialism than the doctrines and practice of Catholics in social questions". For every Catholic, *le socialisme c'est l'ennemi.*[2] Socialism is essentially revolutionary, and Catholics may not capitulate to the implacable enemies of all Christian belief.[3] If the Church is opposed to the dogma of absolute liberty proclaimed by the Revolution, she is equally opposed to that administrative bondage of which Socialism alone can form its ideal.[4] Once we admit the right of the State to regulate production, choosing, as the ideal of economic organisation the continual intervention of the State in the relations of private interests, we must inevitably be drawn into Socialism.

According to Périn, the social problem is more a moral than an economic problem. Indeed, he believes that since moral falling away has generated the abuses we deplore, we are now obliged to regulate the labour of women and children, and to intervene in the relations between employers and workmen in the workshop, and sometimes even out of it, as in the case of the truck system.

When the legislators of the Revolution overthrew by

[1] Ch. Périn, "Le droit nouveau en matière économique," taken from the *Revue catholique des institutions et du droit*, p. 3.

[2] Ch. Périn, *Le socialisme chrétien*, p. 1. Paris: Lecoffre, 1879.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

violence the old economic *régime*, abolishing the entire guild system, there no longer remained any intermediate category between the poles of society: the State and the individual.[1] Now, the two poles of Socialism are Individualism and Collectivism. "Either Collectivity swallows up everything, as in the systems of Saint-Simon, Fourier and Cabet, or Individualism, by means of anarchy, dissolves everything, as in that of Proudhon."[2] Then, on either side, stands Socialism, which Catholics repudiate.

Besides ordinary Christian charity, which "is the first and last word" of Christian social economy,[3] and the moral reform which will result from the action of the Church, Périn finds nothing to oppose to the ills of modern society, beyond vain formulas like "the free Christian corporation,"[4] "Christian co-operation,"[5] "Christian employers,"[6] and many other things, all Christian, but not more efficacious simply for that reason.

And the numerous schools created by Périn in France and Belgium have in no wise got beyond the conclusions of their founder.

The Le Play school, which has for its organ *La Réforme Sociale*, and the principal interpreter of which is Claude Jannet, includes in its ranks the greater number of French Catholics who interest themselves in social economics. The modest Catholic engineer could never, perhaps, have foreseen the very great success and wide diffusion with which his theories have met.

Claude Jannet, the most attractive and erudite among the

[1] Charles Périn, work cited, p. 43.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 43-44.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 48. This is not, however, the opinion held by many other learned Catholic writers.

[4] See the address delivered at Chartres and published in the appendix to *Le socialisme chrétien.*

[5] Ch. Périn, *La co-opération chrétienne.* Paris: Lecoffre, 1886.

[6] Ch. Périn, *Le patron, ses fonctions, ses devoirs, ses responsabilités.* Paris: Lecoffre, 1886. See also the other works by Périn, *Les lois de la société chrétienne; De la richesse dans les sociétés chrétiennes; Les doctrines économiques depuis un siècle; Mélanges de politique et d'économie*, etc., edited by Lecoffre, Paris.

interpreters of Le Play, is recognised even by his adversaries as one of the most important and competent French Economists of the day.

According to Jannet, social reforms must be the combined result of religion, of family influence, of charity taken in its widest sense, of self-help, of the interests secured by free and voluntary association, and of the action of the State exercised in making justice respected. The State has an important mission, but cannot with impunity overstep certain limits. With the exception of the observance of Sunday, the law should act with great reserve in all that regards the labour of adults. "Christian Socialism" is but a play upon words, for of a truth Socialism in the modern era stands as the formula of anti-Christianism.[1]

The theories of economic Liberalism maintained by the Le Play school, are also shared by a great number of the professors of the Catholic Universities, by the group of jurisconsults presided over by M. Lucien Brun,[2] by the *Revue des institutions et du droit* (published at Grénoble), by the group of the Catholic industrialists of the north, by the review of the Jesuits, *Les études religieuses*, which recently published articles by Father Fristot and Father Caudron, who entirely accept the programme of Le Play, and, finally, by Father Ludovic de Besse, the founder of the popular banks.[3] They were also those of

[1] Claude Jannet made a brief exposition of these theories in his lecture at Geneva, 28th February, 1890, published in the *Quatre écoles d'économie sociale*, Geneva, Stapelmohr, 1890; and still more at length in his book, *Le Socialisme d'état et la réforme sociale*, Paris, Plon, 1890. See also his numerous articles in the *Correspondant* and in the *Réforme Sociale*, and his recent book, *Le capital, la spéculation et la finance au xix^e siècle*, p. 608, Paris, Plon, Nourrit et C^ie., 1892.

[2] The social theories of M. L. Brun are exposed at length in his *Introduction à l'étude du droit*, 2^me édition. Paris: Lecoffre, 1887.

[3] At the Congress of Liége, in 1890, both Father Caudron and Father Forbes atempted to defend the Catholic school of the non-interventionists, but the current was so strong against them that their defence met with an unfavourable reception. See G. de Molinari, "Chronique," in the *Journal des économistes*, October, 1890. See also the speeches made by Father Caudron and Father Forbes in the supplements of the *Gazette de Liége*, 9th and 10th September, 1890.

the late Monseigneur Freppel, who in open Parliament declined all solidarity of economic views with Count de Mun.

Father Ludovic de Besse admits that free competition in trade is in no wise contrary to the principles of Christianity. According to him it is, consequently, an error on the part of Catholics to keep their eyes fixed on the old social *régime* in which a host of privileged bodies had, as compensation for the monopoly they enjoyed, the obligation of seeing that the moral law was respected, which they only succeeded in doing more or less.[1] With the view of alleviating the misery and the moral sufferings of the working-class, Father Ludovic has promoted co-operative stores, popular savings banks, and free registry offices.

At the Congress of Liége, in 1890, Father Ludovic de Besse made a clear exposition of his theories in a brief but elaborate memorial on the *Œuvres destinées à ramener et à protégér l'honnêteté chrétienne dans le travail.* The zealous Capuchin, who acts as secretary to the *Crédit mutuel et populaire* at Paris, considers that it is necessary, at whatever cost, to arrest the rapid tide of discontent. But isolated efforts can be of small avail. If we wish to oppose a barrier of sufficient height, we must have recourse to a system of associations which alone can be productive of good effects. It, therefore, becomes necessary to found institutions of an economic order, destined to protect and even restore Christian honesty in the world of labour. These foundations may be societies for the supply of articles of food, building societies for the erection of cheap dwellings for the people, popular banks, etc. Many would fain seek to remedy the sufferings of the working-classes by suppressing freedom of labour, and would have the

[1] Father Ludovic de Besse has detailed at length his programme in his book on the *Association chrétienne des honnêtes gens sur le terrain des affaires*, Paris, 1884; Librairie du crédit mutuel. See also Jannet, *Le socialisme d'état*, chap. ix.; Ch. Gide, *Du rôle du pasteur dans les questions sociales*, p. 17, Paris, 1889. See likewise the address delivered by Father Ludovic de Besse at the second meeting of the Congress of Liége, published in the *Gazette de Liége*, 10th September. Father Ludovic is also the editor of an economic paper, *L'Union économique*, which is not wanting in interest.

State fix for each category of manufacture and commerce the number of persons authorised to practise a trade, thus measuring and restricting the wants of customers. But this odious return to the old guild system, with its monopolies, is utterly impracticable; institutions, like rivers, never flow backwards to their source. The guilds have had their day, and must now be replaced by co-operative societies, which leave the workman free to labour honestly, but condemn all those who would act dishonestly to disappear.

Thus the disciples of Le Play, like those of Périn, by attributing to the social problem more of a moral than of an economic character, by refusing the State the right of interfering for the protection of adult workmen, unless to assure rest from labour on Sundays, by admitting that competition is a principle conformable with the doctrines of Christianity, and by denying that the State should regulate the distribution of social wealth, not only keep aloof from Socialism, but almost all, with more or less sincerity of purpose, rally around the standard of economic Liberalism.

Parallel to this Conservative current runs another, less wide perhaps, but far more active, more original, and more venturesome. Its centre of propaganda is the *Œuvre des cercles catholiques d'ouvriers*, and its principal inspirer and leader Count Albert de Mun, one of the finest speakers of the French Chamber of Deputies. In their review, as in their clubs and in Parliament, Count de Mun and his friends support with much ardour and efficacy the doctrines of Hitze and Vogelsang.

Although this second school combats the claims of Democratic Socialism on theoretic grounds, it nevertheless accepts, in practice, a good part of its economic programme. And the Socialists themselves, though far from sharing the religious tendencies of the party, do not attempt to conceal their sympathy towards the *Œuvre* and its principal inspirer, Count de Mun. There are, says Malon, even among the Conservatives, "some generous spirits whom the present economic struggle fails to intimidate, who throw themselves into the thick of the fight, stigmatising bourgeois egoism and the

spoliations perpetrated by capital, and demanding a greater degree of security and ease for the labouring classes. But to this economic 'semi-Socialism' they join an unreasonable species of religious and political 'Conservatism,' which opposes the old dogmas to science, and monarchical traditions to the Revolution. In this manner, despite their imperfect but unquestionable good-will, and their laudable feeling of justice, De Mun and his friends will never reach the people's heart. Socialism requires generous spirits, ready to sacrifice all to the love of truth, and without any fear of an Unknown that is to come. The men of the *Association Catholique* will never go that length. Nevertheless, we are glad to notice their good-will, which affords a noble contrast to the blind selfishness, pusillanimous want of understanding and culpable hostility of bourgeois 'Conservatism' in general."[1] Another of the most valiant collaborators of the *Revue Socialiste*, though hostile to Catholicism, calls the founders of the *Œuvre des cercles catholiques d'ouvriers* and the collaborators of the *Association Catholique*, "men of worth, who are, socially speaking, in advance of their party".[2]

On the other hand, not only does the *Association Catholique* accept no small part of the economic tendencies of Socialism and subscribe unrestrictedly to the deliberations of the German Socialists assembled at Halle,[3] not only does it hold the efforts of the Socialists in high consideration, but very frequently defends their cause with great warmth.

A review that serves as organ of the *Association de la jeunesse française*, and which is an offshoot of the *Association Catholique*, declared frankly: "Between the Socialists and ourselves there is this in common: we both recognise the necessity of *radical changes* to remedy the present state of disorganisation existing in modern society. But between us, again, stands this absolute difference: they think to

[1] See the article by Malon, "Les confluents du socialisme," in the *Revue Socialiste*, January, 1889.

[2] See the article by Bénédict, "Catholicisme social," in the *Revue Socialiste*, December, 1885.

[3] See the *Association Catholique*, p. 619, 15th May, 1890.

reconstruct without God, while we only hope to do so with God and with His law."[1]

Now, it is of far greater importance to the economist and sociologist to study the tendency to innovation which is common alike to Catholic Socialists and Democratic Socialists, than the differences existing between them in matters of religious belief.

Although the Catholic Socialists in France meet with such large sympathies among the most advanced Socialists, they are, nevertheless, forced to carry on their work exposed to the hostility of a great part of the Catholics, and the continual persecutions of the Liberal Conservative party. A Liberal paper went so far as to say, very erroneously, that "Catholic Socialism is the most violent and radical Communism".[2] And the gravest and most moderate organ of the Conservatives affirmed that Catholic Socialism, as inculcated by the *Œuvre*, "would prove no less dangerous than State Socialism".[3]

On the morrow of the deplorable scenes of the Commune a group of Catholics, instigated by Count Albert de Mun, then the most brilliant orator of the legitimist party, founded in Paris the *Œuvre des cercles catholiques d'ouvriers*.

The Central Committee of Paris, reserving the direction of the movement to itself, then divided France into seven large

[1] See the anonymous article on "Socialisme d'État," in *Le xx^e Siècle* (a review published at Marseilles), p. 121, footnote; June, 1890. On this second school in general, consult A. de Fontpertuis, "Les idées économiques et sociales des nouvelles écoles théocratiques," in the *Journal des économistes*, pp. 367-395, December, 1880; Courcelle Seneuil, "Les socialistes cléricaux, le père Félix et M. de Mun," in the *Journal des économistes*, pp. 5-44, July, 1876; G. de Molinari, "Les congrès catholiques," in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, pp. 410-430, 15th September, 1885; De Haussonville, "Socialisme d'état et socialisme chrétien," in the same review, pp. 867-869, 15th June, 1890; etc. However, Father Félix, whom Courcelle Seneuil erroneously considers as a Socialist, is nothing more than a wordy preacher. See the unimportant works by Père Félix, *Le progrès par le christianisme; Le charlatanisme social; Christianisme et socialisme; Le socialisme devant la societé;* Paris: Roger et Chernovitz.

[2] See the *xix^e Siècle*, 18th February, 1884.

[3] See the *Journal des débats*, 29th January, 1884.

zones, appointing a local committee for each zone. Each committee is even now composed of four sections: the first is charged with the work of propaganda; the second, with the foundation and continuation of the clubs; the third, with all matters of finance, creation, and administration of income; the last attends to education. In each committee the persons appointed to the office of secretary are chosen by the president and leading members of the *Œuvre*, who direct the whole movement in an authoritative and almost absolute manner.[1]

The *Œuvre*, which arose on the ruins of 1870, has striven to keep clear of all revolutionary doctrines, and to re-act against the individualistic and materialistic tendencies prevailing since 1789. "The upper classes," says a report published in 1874, "by fostering the subversive philosophy of the eighteenth century, and ceasing to protect the people, daily expose the nation to ruin."[2] The founders of the *Œuvre* seek to oppose "to subversive doctrines and disastrous teachings the sacred precepts of the Gospel . . . to atheistic negation Catholic affirmation".[3] Hence the members of the working men's clubs belonging to the *Œuvre* must not only be Catholics, but must also conform to certain religious practices.[4] Each of the local committees enjoys great liberty of action, but is obliged to submit to the decisions of the Central Committee.

This committee, called *Comité de l'Œuvre*, has the entire management of the movement, but this unity of management in no way hampers the liberty of each particular association. The members of the *Œuvre* may be workmen, or also persons who though not belonging to the labouring classes yet accept the programme of the association.

Each club founded by the local committees has its own chapel, its recreation hall, offices for the administration, a library,

[1] See G. de Molinari, "Les congrès catholiques," in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15th September, 1885.

[2] *Exposé de l'Œuvre des cercles catholiques d'ouvriers.* Paris, 1874.

[3] *Appel aux hommes de bonne volonté.* Paris, December, 1871.

[4] For all information on the origin, aims, tendency, and spread of the *Œuvre* see the *Instruction sur l'Œuvre*, p. 280. Paris, 1887.

a private room for the director, another for the chaplain, and a garden; in short, it serves as a place of recreation and instruction for all the workmen forming part of it, and at the same time affords them security for a greater stability of life and real protection.[1]

According to the principles of the *Œuvre* it is necessary that the present organisation of labour should be replaced by the guild or corporation system. The guild must, however, be Catholic, or it will be wanting in all true spirit of justice and charity; it must be "hierarchical," or based upon authority, "which is the necessary condition of order and prosperity in every form of society"; it must be associated, so that no single effort be lost or wasted; it must be a craft guild, for the craft or trade is the strongest bond between workmen; it must be a family guild, so as to embrace within its functions all the duties and wants of the household; it must possess property of its own, for without property it can have no real existence in the economic order; it must be legal, that is to say, recognised and protected by public power.[2] As early as 1885 there already existed fifty committees and over one hundred clubs.[3] The workmen associated to the *Cercles*, besides receiving assistance in case of sickness or accident, are furnished with diplomas, which serve them as valuable letters of recommendation to Catholic employers of labour; moreover, the committees generally see to providing them with work.

The organ of the *Œuvre* is *La Corporation.* But the review which best interprets its ideas, the only French Catholic social economic review, and one which has a certain scientific solidity, is the *Association Catholique, revue des questions sociales et ouvrières*, around which has formed a whole group of Catholic economists and writers, led by La Tour du Pin Chambly,

[1] See *Instruction sur l'Œuvre*, as cited above.

[2] See the *Instruction sur l'Œuvre*, 3me partie. See, also, on the aims, programme, and propaganda of the *Œuvre*, Léon Harmel, *Manuel d'une corporation chrétienne*, pp. 224-229, 287-288, 347-350, Tours, 1879, 2me édition; De Molinari, *Les congrès catholiques;* and the "Bulletin de l'Œuvre," published in each number of the *Association Catholique.*

[3] G. de Molinari, article cited.

Ségur-Lamoignon, Urbain Guérin, Geoffroy de Grandmaison, De Pascal, etc., whose views have much analogy with those expressed in Austria by the review founded by the late Baron Von Vogelsang.

Count Albert de Mun, to whom the success of the *Œuvre* is principally due, and who supports its views in Parliament with remarkable ability and eloquence, is a man of wonderful energy and tenacity. He had formerly served as captain in a cavalry regiment, and has endowed his propaganda with much of his own soldierly fire and resolution.[1]

De Mun sees no other way of salvation than by returning to the old economic *régime* of the middle ages, and restoring the guilds.

The law of personal interest, which serves as basis to modern civilisation, has, according to De Mun, given a most immoral impulse to the money market. The immediate consequence of this has been a most disastrous flooding, and our century will always be remembered as the century of usury. "The ever-widening gulf placed between capital and labour by the law of personal interest has driven labour to demand resources, not from mutual credit and the force of association, but from the withholders of public wealth, who have exploited it by their excessive profits. Under the actual circumstances, everything has contributed to increase the evil: the extensive development of every sort of enterprise, the transformation introduced by machinery, the necessity of competition, have all compelled industry to amass large capital, in order to form which it has had recourse to financial societies. These, thanks to the title of 'anonymous,' which screens them, have done away with the responsibility of the master, and allow of an abnormal increase of production, which is all to the profit of the capitalists, and, in consequence of periodical crises, generally ends by dragging the workmen into forced strikes.

"Free credit has converted the stock market into a mere

[1] On the life and tendencies of Count de Mun see the article by Sybil in the *Revue Bleue*, 11th January, 1890. See also the article "Graf Albert de Mun," in the *Oesterreichische Monatsschrift für Christlich Social-Reform*, pp. 370-378; July, 1888.

game of hazard of the most culpable description, inasmuch as it confers a fictitious value on real capital, thus making it yield scandalous profits.

"From this has arisen a new and cosmopolitan power, ever concentrated in fewer hands, which makes trade, industry and agriculture its tributaries, exploits landed property, over which it tyrannises by means of mortgage; compromises and appropriates very frequently even public wealth, monopolising it by means of stock-jobbing and speculation on the national debt, which, thanks to the present loan system, is constantly increasing; and, finally, reduces the labouring masses to sudden alternations from wealth to poverty, while offering to the victims it exploits visions of unhoped-for riches, which are but too often destroyed by irremediable catastrophes.

"I often hear it said," continues De Mun, "that the condition of the working-class is now better than what it formerly was. I am not of this opinion, for there exists an evil never met with before our day, and which is the fruit of the Revolution, an evil which originates at one and the same time in the contempt of divine law and the letting loose of absolute liberty. It is not poverty, but pauperism, or the precarious condition of a multitude of workers reduced to misery at a moment's notice by the very sudden modifications of the industrial system. In the agricultural districts it is the breaking up of households, the instability of families, the disappearance of entire centres of population, and the creation of a rural proletariat, having an analogy with that of the industrial centres.

"And now comes the culminating point of the question. Were it only this, a social order based upon two words—stock-jobbing and pauperism, that depends upon the omnipotence of the banks, and generates the proletariat, such a social order is judged and condemned. It has no right to plume itself, or to present itself to the nation and to the whole world as a *régime* of enfranchisement, equality and justice. It has produced the harshest of slaveries, the most iniquitous of inequalities. It has no right to celebrate its progress and reforms. It has caused Christian society to revert to the customs of paganism. In its codes and laws it has formulated

all the abuses with which the ancient *régime* was imbued; and, finally, has replaced Christian legislation and traditional customs by the principles of pagan Rome and the maxims of the lawyers of the fourteenth century."[1]

What is this popular liberty so much spoken of, so much vaunted? "I hear it spoken of on all sides," says De Mun, "but I see only persons who confiscate it to their own profit. This liberty is proclaimed everywhere as the beginning of the enfranchisement of the people, and I see that in practice it leads to the servitude of the workers. Absolute liberty, born of the Revolution, has chosen personal interest as the scope of its efforts, and by divesting sovereign power of the duty of protection, which is the foundation of its right, thus suppressing at one stroke all tutelary intervention, has abandoned the weaker, without defence, to the tyranny of the stronger, creating individualism, which leaves them isolated, confronting each other. It has opened the way to free competition; that is to say, to implacable war, like those titanic duels on the great American rivers, in which two steamers belonging to rival companies at times indulge, when they go at full speed till they blow up with all the crew and passengers." The disastrous formula, *laissez-faire*, now serves to consecrate the abuses of power. "The passion of speculation invades everything; a conflict without respite has taken the place of healthy emulation; the lesser industries are crushed, trade is falling away, wages are decreasing, and pauperism is spreading like a terrible leprosy. The workman, seeing himself exploited, feels implacable hatred spring up and ferment in his heart; his only refuge is in resistance, he has nothing to fall back upon but open warfare; strikes and coalitions have replaced the organisation of labour. But what matters it? *Laissez-faire, laissez-passer!* It is in the interests of Liberalism. Such is the liberty of the Revolution. It has but one name: the liberty of force." It would now be culpable to dissimulate the truth, or pass over in silence these deep-rooted evils. In vain do the Liberals, who, for the most part, have succeeded by speculating on the passions awakened by

[1] See *Le xx^e Siècle*, pp. 137-139; June, 1890.

the Revolution, in vain do they hasten to say: You appeal to subversive passions. "We are called Socialists," says De Mun, "because we recognise what is legitimate in the claims of the labouring classes; it is said that we disturb public tranquillity, because we see the necessary and inevitable consequence of revolutionary principles in the violent complaints of those who now demand to enjoy the fruits of the Revolution in their turn, and who, instead of making revolutions for the benefit of others, clamour to make at last their own that which has been promised to them, and for which they took up arms." [1]

Now, in order to remedy all this immense disorder produced by the abuse of liberty, it is necessary to return to the old institutions, which were brutally overthrown by the Revolution. We must renounce this economic liberty, the fatal effects of which are eating away the vitals of the social organism. The guild system, by rendering the position of the workman less insecure, while attaching him to his trade and creating him different ties, can alone restore social peace.[2] There is, naturally, no question of free guilds; being without privileges, these could not survive or prosper. Only the compulsory guilds, with capital of their own, and duly recognised and protected by the State, can put an end to the cruel strife that forms the greatest danger for modern society and for the future. Indeed, the real cause of pauperism, discontent, and strikes is "the isolation of the workman, that fatal antagonism which estranges him from his master, and holds apart these two factors of production, whose union is the indispensable condition of social peace and national prosperity". When, however,

[1] See the address delivered at Chartres and published in the *Association Catholique, revue des questions sociales et ouvrières*, pp. 472-480; 15th September, 1878.

[2] See the speeches made by Count de Mun, "La question sociale" (Assemblée Générale, 1878), "L'association professionnelle catholique" (Paris, Assemblée Générale, 1878), "La corporation" (Paris, Assemblée Générale, 1882), "Les syndacats professionnels" (Paris, Chambre des députés, 1883), published by the *Œuvre des cercles catholiques d'ouvrières;* and the complete collection, in three volumes, of the *Discours du comte Albert de Mun*, Paris, Poussielgue. The first volume contains the speeches on the *questions sociales*, the two last contain his political speeches.

labour is organised on the guild system, "strikes will be replaced by arbitration, and *apprenticeship* will be properly reconstituted so as to prevent the falling off of professional ability, which favours the invasion of foreign labour".[1]

On the subsiding of certain great strikes, Count de Mun brought forward a resolution in the French Chamber, in which he called upon the Government to take, as soon as possible, the measures necessary to favour a beginning of association and of professional solidarity between employers and employees, and he introduced a special bill on provident funds for trades guilds, destined to aid the workmen in case of accident or involuntary strikes, and which was intended to prepare the way for the adopting of an international legislation, which would permit each State to protect workmen, women, and children from the excesses of labour, and, finally, for the protection of French labour by means of a proper set of laws.[2]

The following year, in a letter addressed to Viscount de Bélizal, Count de Mun traced out the leading features of the programme of the Catholic social party. He would have his party support the limitation of labour by imposing the Sunday rest as a legal obligation; by prohibiting night work for women, and by the gradual suppression of the labour of women, and of children of both sexes; by creating protective laws against accidents, sickness, involuntary strikes, and inability for work resulting from old age. In order to render these laws practical and efficacious, he, moreover, wished to establish a corporative organisation, destined, according to the papal encyclical letter, *Humanum genus*, "to protect under the tutelage of religion the interests of labour and the morals of the labouring classes".[3]

[1] See the speech on the labour crisis delivered by Count de Mun at the French Chamber, 25th January, 1884, and published in the *Association Catholique*, March, 1884.

[2] *Ibid.* This resolution was signed by nineteen other Catholics, among whom was the late Monsignor Freppel.

[3] See "Les lettres et le programme du Comte Albert de sur l'organisation de l'union catholique," in the *Association Catholique*, p. 666; December, 1885. This programme was so strongly combated by the "Conservative Right" party, that De Mun was forced to withdraw it.

The law passed on the 21st March, 1884, by which syndicates were instituted, was a first victory for M. de Mun and the partisans of the guild system. But the Catholics did not halt there; the division between masters and workmen created by the bill of 1884 appeared to them both unjust and harmful, as in this manner the dissension existing between industrialists and workers remained unaltered. According to the Catholics the establishment of mixed syndicates would have proved a better means of attaining the end in view.

Even before the International Conference of Berlin, Count de Mun, together with his colleagues, M. de Montalembert, M. Thellier de Poncheville, M. La Cour Grandmaison, and M. de Ramel, presented a bill on the labour of children and adult workmen, which, if it failed to meet the approbation of the Conservative party and of the Catholic Liberals, won instead the applause of the Socialists. Ferroul, the Socialist deputy for Narbonne, on the introduction of De Mun's bill, said in Parliament: "I have read M. de Mun's declarations, and, together with my friends, cannot but commend them; his demands are, in reality, identical with those formulated by the Socialist congresses".[1] To the moderate Catholics, instead, De Mun's bill for the reorganisation of labour seemed so daring that even Monsignor Freppel, who, in 1884, had subscribed to his resolution, now declared that he would have neither State Socialism nor Church Socialism, that he feared the one as much as the other, and could see no other solution to the social question than in the efficient union of individual liberty and voluntary association.[2]

In the report which accompanied the project for his bill, De Mun declares that in the workman we must consider the father, the soldier, and the elector, and that, consequently, the wage-earner should not meet with any obstacle to the fulfil-

[1] See the *Réforme Sociale*, p. 601; 15th May, 1890.

[2] See the *Univers*, 6th January, 1890. Monsignor Freppel had for some time directly opposed the tendency De Mun was seeking to communicate to the Catholic movement, and at the congress of Catholic jurisconsults held at Tours in 1890, he attacked not only the French Catholic Socialists, but even the late Cardinal Manning. See *L'Anjou* of Angers, 8th October, 1890.

ment of his three-fold mission, and that the proper working of universal suffrage calls for a degree of education only compatible with a certain amount of ease and comfort. Hence the demand for a reduction of the working-day is perfectly legitimate, inasmuch as in European countries the duration of labour very frequently passes all just measure. It is a duty to protect the workman, for he is not free, but depends instead upon capital, which, unlike the wage-earner, is never obliged to face a necessity requiring immediate satisfaction, and can thus wait without any risk. The advantages of the bill on labour syndicates, passed in 1884, are quite illusory, since the greater number of the masters refuse to negotiate officially with the representatives of the syndicates, and even sometimes exclude them from the workshops. The penal measures proposed against these abuses threaten to remain platonic. The workman is now more than ever at the mercy of the capitalist, and while the rights of private property are ever assuming a more absolute character, the suppression of collective property has rendered it very difficult for the workman to acquire any, or to form any capital, and has left him without any effective guarantee or any hope for the future. There can, consequently, exist no doubt as to the necessity for recognising the rights of labour and of emancipating the workman's personality, and that "the State owes the working man protection, because he is weak, and also as a compensation for the persistent injustice by which he has been oppressed".[1]

After proposing a series of measures destined to protect the labour of women and children, De Mun's principal aim was to protect, through this bill, the labour of adult workmen. According to the bill, the effective duration of labour should not exceed fifty-eight hours per week; that is, ten hours on

[1] Count de Mun declared to an English journalist that he had nothing to say against the eight hours' working-day. And when the bill on the manufacture of matches, which is a State monopoly, was discussed at the French Chamber, he consequently voted in favour of the amendment presented by several Socialist deputies, fixing the working day at eight hours. See, likewise, in the *Association Catholique*, p. 715 and following, 15th June, 1890, the "Proposition de loi de M. le comte Albert de Mun sur la réglementation du travail devant la Commission de la Chambre".

the five days from Monday to Friday, and eight hours on Saturdays (art. 8 and 9). Inspectors appointed by Government should keep up a rigorous supervision, not only in the large industrial establishments, but also in the small workshops and over home labour, and the strict application of the law should be carefully attended to.

The bill further contains a great number of measures taken from Austrian, German, and Swiss laws. The power granted to the *prud'hommes* of rendering the regulations and prices homologated by them obligatory, would doubtless lead to the old customs of the compulsory guilds. The bill, moreover, obliges all masters to deposit in the hands of the inspector of their district a legalised copy of the rate of wages, and to communicate to him all modifications effected (art. 13); to communicate to the inspector every six months a list indicating the number of workmen employed during the last six months, divided into categories according to their wages, and stating the quantity of effective labour performed by each category, with the amount of wages paid for it (art. 14). The inspectors should have full right to enter the workshops at any hour, and to insist on examining the documents attesting the observance of the law.

Starting from the same premises as the Democratic Socialists in his bill on the regulation of labour, Count de Mun, however, shows more affinity with the State Socialists in the measures he proposes. Although, like all Catholic Socialists, he considers the social question to be a moral, as well as an economic question, he admits, with much reason, that the morals of the workman can only improve with the improvement of his economic condition, and that the latter cannot improve so long as he is left at the mercy of capitalists, and till the State resolves to intervene with energy in the matter.[1]

[1] On the importance of M. de Mun's bill and the impression it produced, see the interview between him and the deputy Thellier de Poncheville, in the *Éclair*, 15th December, 1889. The Socialists never neglect any opportunity of expressing their sympathy towards Count de Mun. Lafargue, one of the heads of the party, who was elected deputy after having been sentenced as implicated in the affair of *Fourmies*, in his first

The Marquis La Tour du Pin Chambly, the present director of the *Association Catholique*, and who was also one of the founders of *Œuvre des cercles catholiques d'ouvriers*, is an old soldier, like Count de Mun, whose social views he fully shares.

In his answers to an important set of questions in the *Œuvre*, the Marquis La Tour du Pin traced out, some years ago, the general lines of his programme. In the moral and religious order he considers it necessary to obtain liberty of instruction, the recognition of the legal personality of all associations (excepting those presenting any danger to social order), the abrogation of the divorce law, the liberty of devising by will to the amount of half of the property. In the political order the necessary measures are: the reconstitution of the provincial assemblies, the suppression of administrative jurisdiction, the representation of trade interests to be substituted for universal suffrage; in other words, the substitution of representatives of the re-established trade corporations in the provincial and municipal assemblies.

The reforms necessary in the economic order are still more important: the reconstitution of the professional or trades corporations, the introduction of the homestead system, the strict regulation of "anonymous,' *i.e.*, joint-stock companies, and also the limitation of the contracts upon which they are founded, the protection of agriculture with abrogation of all commercial treaties, etc.[1]

That which is, above all, indispensable is to withdraw the workman from the state of isolation in which he is actually placed. Modern economy, based upon the system of economic liberty and competition, is iniquitous and unjust; the so-called economic liberty of the workman is simply a state of slavery. The question of the maximum limit of labour, and that of the

speech at the French Chamber, 5th December, 1891, made a defence of De Mun, who replied that between him and the Revolution lay an abyss, but that there was likewise an abyss between his views and those generally prevalent among the Conservatives.

[1] See Gide, "Chronique," in the *Revue d'économie politique*, pp. 331-332, May to June, 1889.

minimum limit of wages, must be solved; if Liberal economics has not discovered the means of solving them, it has but proved its own impotency.[1]

The economics of the middle ages was a thousand times preferable to Liberal economics, which is so unjustly vaunted. Then labour was a social function, property a social office, and credit, the third factor of economic life, also took a social form. Even then the formation of capital took place, but stock had not as yet been constituted: money only yielded interest by social contract.[2]

Our representative system, as now in practice, is in open opposition to social tendencies. Absolutism, irresponsibility, and incompetency are the most notable features of our present parliamentary *régime*, which the Liberal school would fain prove to be the final *stadium* of political progress. The parliaments of to-day are invested with absolute power, since they have not, as in former times, any check upon their tendencies. While the Chamber only lasts through one legislation, and the majorities that voted a law consequently retire, and replace one another at brief intervals, the law remains and its effects begin to be felt precisely when those who made it disappear from the scene. If at least this absolute and irresponsible parliamentary power were in some way competent! Instead of that, the parliamentary parties are composed of physicians, civil engineers, lawyers; above all of lawyers, who frequently make themselves prominent among their party by the violence of their opinions, though they do not, for all that, show any capacity in the order of the social functions it would be their duty to fulfil. Nor is it true that the greater number of the electors are, as a rule, satisfied with the parliamentary *régime*. While it deprives the electors forming the minority in the electoral struggle of all power, it does not even furnish a satisfactory expression of the opinions of the majority, which has only been able to form itself through the coalition of parties, which sacrifice their own preferences, not to what is

[1] See the *Association Catholique*, p. 380; 15th March, 1889.

[2] See La Tour du Pin Chambly, *Le centenaire de* 1789, p. 17. Paris: the office of the *Association Catholique*, 1886.

best in the opinion of each, but to what is the least evil. And as all questions, whether social or political, and even the constitution of the country, are abandoned to the arbitration of Parliament, everywhere and always the same three parties are to be found: that of persons who are in power and wish to retain it; that of persons who are no longer in power, yet are not resigned to having lost it; and, finally, that of persons who have not yet attained power, but wish to attain it. Consequently, to form a majority it is necessary that two of these parties unite against the third, and it is precisely on the continual re-uniting and breaking up of these elements that is based the parliamentary system. Hence it comes that one-third of the nation is always oppressed in spite of itself, and another third is oppressed more or less against its will. The parliamentary *régime* does not, as is generally believed, consist in the submission of the minorities to the majority, but in the submission of the majority to a minority.[1]

The Viscount de Ségur-Lamoignon, while he has also little or no faith in the political organisation of modern society, considers our present economic *régime*, in which the power of capital daily increases and becomes more formidable, as simply disastrous.

"In former times," he observes, "there were, as there are

[1] See the pamphlet by La Tour du Pin Chambly, *Le parlementarisme, voilà l'ennemi!* Paris: office of the *Association Catholique*, 1887. On the social, economic, and religious views of La Tour du Pin, see his numerous articles in the *Association Catholique, revue mensuelle des questions sociales et ouvrières*, and particularly "Étude de législation sociale," vol. xvi., p. 670 and following, and vol. xvii., p. 1 and following; "Le mouvement catholique en 1884," vol. xviii., pp. 647 and following; "Politique sociale," vol. xxiii., pp. 16 and following, 122 and following, 234 and following, 366 and following; "Classes historiques, esquisse d'organisation sociale," vol. xxvii., p. 517 and following; "Le régime corporatif," vol. xvi., p. 145 and following; "La répresentation agricole," vol. xvii., p. 685 and following; "L'Œuvre, les écoles et les partis," vol. xvii., p. 4; "L'Œuvre et la crise économique," vol. xvii., p. 137 and following; "Le centenaire de 1789," vol. xxi., p. 481; "Introduction aux études du centenaire," vol. xxv., pp. 235 and following, and 357 and following, etc.

now, rich people, but they did not, as now, control the political[1] and economic situation. This depended in great measure on the fact that the public wealth then consisted in real estate, and did not, consequently, lend itself to stock-jobbing. Now, in all countries, and particularly in France, great advantages are offered to capital with a view to attract it: high rates of interest on stock, payment of interest at a fixed date and in any place, facilities for buying stock almost without extra expense, facility for loans on deposit of certificates, immunity or quasi-immunity from taxes, extraordinary guarantees of security, etc. On the other hand, what private enterprise can offer similar advantages? While any one who wishes to make his capital yield interest in commercial undertakings is obliged to expose himself to heavy losses in order to obtain what is frequently but a very small profit, while the agricultural proprietor is bound to attend to his farming, providing the necessary improvements, bettering his land, standing on guard so as not to be cheated, he who employs his capital in stock has nothing to do but to pocket his interest when due. What wonder, then, if capital abandons agriculture and trade to flow into stock speculation? Credit is not wealth, but a simple right on the wealth of others: stock is nothing but active credit. Credit is almost always the result of a loan, or is a loan which merely transfers a value from one person to another; consequently, it neither produces nor can produce any increment of wealth. If he who takes money on loan employs the capital lent him in some productive industrial undertaking, the wealth represented by the loan is in no way diminished. But if he consumes the capital lent him, or employs it to cover an old debt, or in unproductive enterprise, he thus causes a diminution of the public wealth. Now, on the contrary, stock is not covered by equivalent real estate, but merely serves to cover part of the losses or of the unproductive expenses; consequently, there exists an enormous sum which must be entered as the debt of public wealth. Only a minimum part of the

[1] This is not exact; the political power has always been in the hands of the wealthy. See the excellent book by Loria, *La teoria economica della costituzione politica*. Turin, 1886.

original capital is employed in a productive manner, but as the profits are uncertain they do not correspond to the capital put out, and it becomes necessary to demand money of the ratepayers in order to pay the interest due on it.

"The greater part of State loans is employed in army expenses, works of defence, building of barracks, etc., which represent but a pure loss, and are absolutely unproductive. Another portion, but very small, is dedicated to public works, which, like railways, are very frequently instruments of production and of consumption at the same time.

"In reality, stock is but fictitious wealth; a castle built of cards, which the first blast of wind will overturn. The public debt paralyses the economic life of the State, and the interest of it, which we are obliged to pay, is crushing us. When and how can that capital be paid back? In order to lighten the burden it would be necessary to extinguish the debt, but, before extinguishing it, it would be necessary to cease making new loans.

"The consequence of all this is that stock and capital, joined to the most unbridled speculation, are the arbiters of the European economic market; everything that happens is a proof of the *juiverie* (Jews' reign) of our century, which has enslaved not only the individuals, but the very States themselves.

"Land, the fullest expression of real estate, also tends to become mere 'stock' under the present crushing system of loans on mortgage. Have we, perhaps," concludes Ségur-Lamoignon, "thanks to capitalism, reached such a condition of economic and social dissolution that there remains no other means of salvation than a universal cataclysm, only to be compared to the fall of the Roman empire and the invasion of the Barbarians, from which the essential and permanent elements of social order came forth revivified by the teachings of that most terrible catastrophe? We must not deceive ourselves; it is these aberrations, these economic crimes that have generated Socialism, aided its dangerous progress, and will end by assuring it the victory, not for long, but for that

space of time which Providence will judge necessary for the repentance and amendment of contemporary society."[1]

Father G. de Pascal not only considers that the State ought to interpose in the relations between industrialists and workmen, but that, given the present condition of the labouring class, the minimum wage should be absolutely determined. According to De Pascal, labour (that is, exercise of human activity in which the whole person, body, soul, intelligence and strength participates) cannot be considered as a commodity subject to the fluctuations of the market. Labour should be considered as a *human act*, tending to procure proper means of existence to the *person* from whom it emanates. Here are ten workmen who offer you their labour. You will perhaps pay them less because they are many, and the supply exceeds the demand. But are they not all obliged to make the same efforts to accomplish the same work? The end of labour is the adequate satisfaction of the workman's just wants; the produce, the effect of labour, should consequently satisfy this want. That portion of the results of production which accrues to the workman constitutes wage; consequently, the wage should suffice for the legitimate wants of the wage-earner. This is the standard of judgment which should guide us in fixing the minimum wage, that is to say, the measure of remuneration guaranteed to the workman in all cases. However, it is none the less true that, even after having assured this minimum, a certain oscillation may take place in wages owing to the law of supply and demand. As the scope of human labour is production, the former should be considered as an economic fact quite as much as a moral fact. From this point of view labour is a service rendered in exchange for a remu-

[1] Ségur-Lamoignon, "La dissolution et le capitalisme," in the *Association Catholique*, pp. 545-549, 13th November, 1887. See also the numerous other articles published by the same author in the *Association Catholique*, and especially, "L'action de l'église et l'intervention du pouvoir dans la question économique," vol. xx., p. 49 and following; "L'action sociale du catholicisme et l'optimisme liberal," vol. xix., p. 401 and following; "La crise sociale et économique en Europe," vol. xvii., p. 177 and following; "La liberté du taux de l'interêt," vol. xxi., p. 20 and following, etc.

neration ; it is a value subject to the same oscillations to which other values are subject. A fixed minimum being admitted, wages will rise or fall according to supply and demand and to the value of labour.

But this law, far from being the supreme regulating principle of wages, should only influence that portion of wage which exceeds the minimum demanded by the nature and scope of the labour itself.

But what is this minimum? According to the theory of the classic economic school, which Lassalle so justly termed the "iron law of wages," the normal rate of wage should be determined by the amount strictly necessary for the maintenance of a workman and his family, or, to put it more clearly, necessary to enable the working population to live and reproduce itself. This theory weighs as a heavy yoke upon the labouring class, which it reduces to a state of desperation. Hence it is easy to understand the terrible curses, the furious cries of revolt that the workman hurls against the "iron law" which has created the present iniquitous economic organisation.[1]

If the present condition of the workman is in some respects improved, if there has been an apparent rise in wages, at least nominally, can we affirm with sincerity that *real* wage, which alone is of any account, or, in other words, that the quantity of useful things which the workman can procure or purchase, has, in a general way, increased in ratio to the cost of living the production of labour, or the ever-increasing share accruing to capital as compared with the numerous causes of the slackening or intermittency of labour?

Wages should not only suffice for the individual, but for his family as well. There is, besides, another element to be taken into consideration. A man who has laboured on through long years, and whose labour has been profitable to society, has a right not to be cast aside like a worn-out tool and condemned

[1] Economic science has already, a long time ago, proved that the so-called "iron law" of Lassalle is without any foundation of truth. Even Liebknecht recently denied it, saying that it was but an arm used by the Socialist party to impress the masses.

to beggary. Consequently, wages should be such as to permit the workman to save up against bad times and old age. But this sad problem can never be resolved by merely authoritative means. The real wage, the *human* wage, the *family* wage cannot be restored unless by returning to the corporative associations or personal system, endowed with a corporative property, and the authorities of which, in case of need, will be able, without injuring any one, to fix what is due to each factor of labour.

In the meantime, until social reform, based on the corporative system, can be effected, it is the present duty of the State to determine the minimum wage. If the insufficient remuneration of labour constitutes a violation of justice, it is but logical that the State, being the warden and guardian of justice, should interpose to restore violated order.[1]

Nor are Abbé Morel[2] and M. Sémichon less vehement in their severe criticism of capitalism, to which they attribute all the ills of our present social organisation. Like almost all Catholic economists, they adhere in theory to the criticism of the Democratic Socialists.

Count de Roquefeuil expresses himself with fully as much warmth as Lassalle, and with a severity worthy of Marx. "Between the master and workman of pagan times lay the fetters, the whip, the axe ; the workman was a slave, a *chattel.* The Church combated this slavery, not only by inculcating charity, but by means of the law, in the name of justice, and loosened the fetters, broke the whips and abolished the axe. The workman then became his own master by right, if not in fact. Between the master and workman of to-day lie neither

[1] See the appendix by G. de Pascal, "Le Pouvoir social et l'Ordre économique," published in the third volume of the work by Élie Blanc, *Traité de philosophie scolastique;* Paris: Vie et Amat, 1885. See likewise the pamphlet, *Le collectivisme et ses docteurs*, p. 64; Paris, 1891. De Pascal gives a lengthy criticism (though not always with breadth of views or profound knowledge) of the collectivistic doctrine of Marx, whom he calls the *Luther de la nouvelle religion sociale-matérialiste.*

[2] J. Morel, *Du prêt à interêt, ou des causes théologiques du socialisme.* Paris: Lecoffre, 1873.

fetters, nor whips, nor axe, but hunger, that other slavery, which renders man, though free by right, a proletarian in fact."[1] The so-called liberty of labour, so much lauded, is consequently but an idle and odious lie.

"In the economic situation created by free labour and free competition, the labour contract between the starving workman and the master, who can afford to wait, cannot but be unjust, for liberty of labour (or, rather, what is so termed, but is liberty of capital exclusively) reduces labour to slavery. Starvation forces the workman to accept iniquitous contracts, which he knows can only be to his own detriment; he accepts no matter what price, were it even notoriously insufficient. A crust of bread is better than nothing. When a contract between the strong and the weak is concluded in such a manner, public power becomes the natural protector of the weak."[2]

Count de Bréda, seeking to justify, or at least excuse, the indifference of the Catholics, writes: "The object of justice being exterior and positive, one may, without being unjust, do unjust things. In this case, ignorance is a sufficient excuse for the conscience; and so it is with many very honest persons, who have allowed themselves to be seduced by a system of economy based on the neglect of justice. Consequently, we do not pretend to condemn any one, but it is necessary to rectify any confusion of words and ideas like the one now in question. A man who exerts himself to be charitable—that is, to practise the most perfect form of justice—may yet, without being aware of it, participate in a great social injustice; nor will all his good intentions, which prevent him from being personally guilty of injustice, hinder him from committing unjust actions. It is precisely this which renders it so urgent that the social injustices upon which modern economy is founded should be studied."[3]

[1] Count de Roquefeuil, *Questions sociales et ouvrières, Régime du travail* (published by the *Œuvre*), p. 176 and following. Paris: Lecoffre, 1883.

[2] Count de Roquefeuil, *ibid.*, p. 173 and following.

[3] De Bréda, the same volume, p. 100 and following.

Gabriel Ardant, the valiant co-operator of Rudolph Meyer, in *Papes et Paysans*, a book of much historical interest, has sought to prove that the Catholic Church has never admitted localised possession of land. And it is a fact that many Popes have, on more than one occasion, issued special edicts by which it was decreed that leave was granted to any one to occupy and cultivate land belonging to persons who thought fit to let them lie waste.[1]

It is very evident that the French school, led by De Mun, has been much influenced by the doctrines of Hitze, Ratzinger and Vogelsang. Although the Catholic Socialists of all countries accord in their criticism of capitalism, on which ground they also agree with the most advanced Socialists, not all of them, however, have the courage to accept the consequences of their own principles, and to present a complete programme of social reform. They, as a rule, confine themselves to stigmatising the evils, without proposing any remedy. Now, the French Catholic Socialists, on the contrary, have, for a good number of years, had a well-defined programme, and all strive towards the same end and under the same colours. With the exception of a few points touching on religious matters, the programme of De Mun and the collaborators of the *Association Catholique* is identical with that of the most advanced Socialists. In vain did Count de Mun, in a note communicated to the papers, seek to deny all solidarity with State Socialism, and to reject the very name of it. Both friends and adversaries made reply: *Qui s'excuse, s'accuse!*

If in Germany the Liberal school has never had much popularity, in France, on the contrary, it has left, and still leaves, very marked traces. A profound division has, as a necessary consequence, arisen even among the Catholic supporters of the guild system. Those who, like De Mun, were partisans of the compulsory guilds, soon beheld themselves

[1] G. Ardant, *Papes et Paysans*, p. 268. Paris: Gaume, 1892. However, Ardant, who is a Catholic and a defender of the temporal power, exaggerates a good deal, and, in judging the present state of Italy, allows himself to be guided more by his political feelings than by the testimony of facts.

confronted by the supporters of the free guilds, one of whom is Léon Harmel.[1]

"We will not, upon any account, accept the compulsory guilds," wrote Léon Harmel in the *Association catholique des patrons du nord*, "because the combining of unequal and frequently opposed elements can only, from the moral point of view, produce disastrous effects. Those who would build in company must, first of all, speak the same language. Now, Catholics and Free Thinkers have an entirely different language: the first call honour that which the others term cowardice, the second call liberty what the others consider as slavery; the former are ready to give their life for their duty, while the latter hold rebellion as the first of duties. On all arguments concerning virtue, probity, disinterestedness, the origin and aim of life, they each speak a separate language. How, then, could they act in concert in reconstructing a moral fabric, which demands unity and community of efforts?"[2]

The more intelligent among the young Catholics, those who shun the empty formulas of the old school and cannot bring themselves to accept the conclusions of liberal economics, follow with real enthusiasm the powerful impulse given by the *Œuvre des cercles catholiques d'ouvriers*. In Provence especially the *Association catholique de la jeunesse française*, through the medium of its intrepid review, *Le xx^me^ Siècle*, which is of quite recent origin, diffuses with laudable energy the theories of Count de Mun and of the writers of the *Association Catholique*. The collaborators of *Le xx^me^ Siècle* have adopted the anonymous system, which leaves them greater liberty in their criticism, and allows of their judging with greater independence. But their censure of the abuses of modern capitalism, and the accusations hurled by them against liberal economy, are no less severe than those of the *Association Catholique*. They are young, and, in consequence, easily

[1] See the article by Count de Haussonville, "Socialisme d'état et socialisme chrétien," in the *Revue des deux Mondes*, pp. 839-868, 15th June, 1890.

[2] See Fristot, *Une tentative d'organisation ouvrière dans le nord*, p. 25. Paris: Dumoulin, 1889.

susceptible of enthusiasm and not to be daunted by any difficulties; their stinging invectives against capitalism, their ruthless analysis of the prejudices of Liberalism, the hatred they express for all the formulas of the Liberal school, while they make no attempt to conceal the real evils of the day, and their undissimulated sympathy for the Socialists, render the young and intrepid writers of *Le xx^me^ Siècle* the foremost among the pioneers of Catholic Socialism.

According to Léon Harmel, the guild should be free, but should be legally recognised and have the right of possessing property. Unless the guild is recognised by law its decisions can have no sanction, and in questions of weighty importance —as, for instance, wages, competition, and other trade interests—its council can only adopt inefficacious measures with no serious results. Without the right of possessing property legal recognition would be insufficient, inasmuch as property alone can guarantee the future of the guild, and place it in a position to defend the interests of its members with effect. History shows us that the old-time corporations were of more or less importance according to the greater or lesser degree of prosperity of the confraternities of which the members formed part; consequently, in order to prosper, the guild should have a religious character.[1]

In a letter written on the 31st December, 1888, and addressed to Hervé-Bazin, the valorous young Catholic economist of Angers, who was cut down by death in the flower of his years and hopes, Léon Harmel unfolded his opinions and intentions with regard to the propaganda, and the means of propaganda of the *Œuvre.*

Modern economics, according to Harmel, which are based on the principle of struggle and competition, are unjust and anti-Christian. Labour should serve as a bond of union among men, and has become, instead, the principle of division, hatred, and fratricidal warfare. While the Gospel says, "Love one another," modern economics say, "Destroy one another". The so-called liberty of the workman is but slavery, and the means

[1] Léon Harmel, *Catéchisme du patron*, chap. iv. Paris: Office of *La Corporation*, 1889.

which were supposed to be destined to raise his dignity have but served instead to lower it. Isolation has generated diffidence and jealousy. Economics have, in consequence, become a terrible battlefield, where master and workman are rivals and enemies reciprocally.

The Catholics should, therefore, take advantage of the law on syndicates, and try and establish trade associations. Experience has proved that the mixed syndicate is one of the most efficacious means of assuring social peace; the organisation of trade imposes itself as a question of life or death. Under the pretext of protecting labour, the enemies of social order are everywhere striving with the utmost activity to group the workmen together by trades, their real object, however, being to train them as instruments of war against society.[1]

But Léon Harmel's chief merit is not so much his having explained in two books, which from their point of view are not wanting in interest, the proper organisation of all Christian corporations, and what should be the duties of masters,[2] as that he has applied his programme on a large scale in his factory at Val-des-Bois.

"The social question," says Harmel, "is not only a question of food, clothing, and lodging; it is, above all, a question of peace of heart. What matters most is not that the workman be richer or poorer, but that he be content with his lot. And while we see social peace reigning in localities where the wages are at the lowest rate, agitation and discontent frequently give rise to conflicts among populations enjoying much higher wages."[3]

Starting from this principle, Léon Harmel has, above all, sought to assure peace and tranquillity among his work people

[1] See Léon Harmel's letter to Hervé-Bazin in the *Association Catholique*, pp. 367-373; 15th March, 1889.

[2] Léon Harmel, *Manuel d'une corporation chrétienne*, p. 538, 2nd edition, Tours, 1879; *Catéchisme du patron*, p. 209, elaborated with the aid of a number of theologians, Paris, 1889. See, likewise, the address delivered by Harmel at the Congress of Liége, 1890, in the supplement of the *Gazette de Liége*, 9th September, 1890.

[3] Léon Harmel, *Manuel d'une corporation chrétienne*, p. 223.

by means of a series of economic and moral measures, which are well worth being studied. The workmen of Val-des-Bois enjoy the greatest liberty possible, and no important deliberation is taken without the members of the corporation having previously been assembled and consulted. A number of very ably planned regulations allow of the workmen's taking part in the administration, and make them acquainted with the prices of the purchase and sale of goods.

The corporation of Val-des-Bois, which is composed of the work people of the Harmel factory, came into existence as early as 1867. When the establishment was destroyed by a terrible fire in 1874, the corporation already counted one hundred and forty-four members, and was affiliated to the *Œuvre des cercles catholiques*. It had been founded, however, a considerable time before the formation of the *Œuvre*.

Each family belonging to the corporation has its book. The owner of a book is bound, under penalty of losing his rights, to see that each time he buys goods from the trades people connected with the corporation, or obtains bread tickets from the office, the amount of the purchase, which must be made directly, is written down in corporation money. Every three months the books are handed over to the treasurer, who calculates the amount of the draft on the corporation, according to the sums he finds entered.

The council meets every six weeks, and directs the whole movement of the association. Four sections, having each a well-defined office, meet once a week. The first attends to the mutual aid society, the society against accidents, the burial society, the hygiene and bathing society; the second controls the privileged trades people; the third sees to all purchases, the clothing exhibition, drafts on the corporation for the hospital; finally, the fourth has charge of the corporation fund, of the savings bank, of the accident and sickness fund, of life insurance, of instruction in the trade, of the annual bursarships for the technical school, of legal consultations, and of matrimonial formalities.

The money of the corporation, which is coined so as to render falsification impossible, or, at least, very difficult, is

recognised and accepted only by purveyors and trades people who have made a regular contract with the corporation.

The mutual aid society, of which the master is president, furnishes sick members with medicines and medical advice gratuitously, and allows them, during their illness, a daily indemnity equal to their monthly quota of insurance; in case of accident it grants a supplementary indemnity, which is paid by *La Royale Belge* Insurance Company. Thus, if a workman loses a limb, or is obliged, in consequence of some injury, to change his occupation, the company assures him a pension based on his daily pay and age, and to which he can never lose his right. If the accident produces death the company pays to his heirs, within the three months following his decease, a premium equal to four hundred working days. The society also furnishes the children of members with books gratuitously, and provides burial expenses for deceased members. The quota paid by the members barely amounts to one and a half per cent. of their wage.

A doctor, who is paid by the master, gives free consultations, and medicines are furnished gratuitously. The sick, whose names are entered at the office, are daily visited by the doctor. Those who prefer to go to the hospital at Rheims are sent there at the expense of the mutual aid society.

By means of special contracts with a butcher, a cheesemonger, a baker, a grocer, and a green-grocer the corporation secures numerous advantages for its members. The prices of provisions are fixed every month according to an agreement with the council, and are posted up in the meeting-rooms. The treasurer receives a discount of five per cent., paid in goods, on all purchases made by members of the corporation, who are obliged to see that the amount is entered in their books. Every three months the treasurer notes down in the books the sum entered by each purveyor; the result of this gives the total amount due. Five per cent. forms the "bonus" of the corporation; the rest goes to the corporation fund. The trades people are not allowed to sell goods to any of the members at prices higher than those fixed by the

council, but the council guarantees them the credit of the members up to a certain determined sum. In this manner the members can purchase goods at a price below the ordinary rate. Coals and breadstuff are furnished directly by the association, according to the requirements of the members. As soon as a waggon-load comes in each member's order is sent home, thus saving the expense and risk of warehousing. Twice a year a species of exhibition is held of dress materials ordered from the principal factories, and of ready-made clothes supplied by a wholesale dealer. The workmen's wives inspect these samples and order what they require. The families pay for their clothing by means of a stoppage of wages, the amount of which is fixed beforehand.

The bonuses paid to members of the corporation, the amount of which is determined by the treasurer under the responsibility of the third section, are composed of a discount of five per cent. on all purchases made from the purveyors or from the corporation, and are distributed at the grand festivals.

Besides this, there is a hospice for childless widows and orphans. Each widow has her small bedroom; the garden and living rooms are in common. The corporation fund is formed of legacies and donations, and of the discount given by the trades people and the profits of sales, from which the bonuses of the members are deducted. The revenue of the fund is distributed among the clubs and societies of which the corporation is composed. The corporation savings bank is divided into three branches: the first is destined for those whose savings already exceed one hundred francs; the second, for those who are only beginning to lay by, and need encouragement; the third is for the school children. A provident fund has been founded to aid workmen who have served in the factory for more than twenty-five years. Competitions have been established among the young men and girls with a view to encourage them to learn the trade, and a bursarship for the technical school of Lille is yearly conferred.

The fourth section lays in supplies of beer, coffee, syrups, and wine directly from the merchants, and supervises the sale

of these articles, which is carried on by one of the members, who receives a compensation for his trouble.

Léon Harmel has, moreover, very justly considered it a mistake to build large working-men's dwellings, in which the work people would be crowded together and forced to live in close proximity. Instead of that, the houses at Val-des-Bois are small, each with its little garden, and within a radius of six hundred metres from the factory; the rent varies according to the size of the tenement.

The working of all these societies is principally entrusted to the members of the corporation. "The time we consecrate to our societies," exclaims, with true Christian ardour, the eminent Catholic industrialist of Val-des-Bois, "the pecuniary outlay they entail, is it not all amply compensated, from an industrial point of view, by the conscientious labour, the diligent care of the members, by a greater degree of stability, and by the affectionate and trusting concord which facilitates the administration? Is it, then, nothing to see frank, open faces, and to live in the midst of men who love us, and whose affection renders their respect more sincere, their devotedness truer? Not to mention the spiritual advantages: how could Jesus Christ, who was Himself a workman, be insensible to the homage of a master, or, rather, the father of a numerous family of working people, who offers Him not only his own heart and those of his children, but also the hearts of his people, who begin to love the Saviour because they have been taught to know Him?"[1]

Even those who in no way share Léon Harmel's religious views, and who most differ from him in such matters, cannot but admire the bold attempt of the Catholic industrialist, who, without once faltering before the immense difficulties of his undertaking, has ventured to apply his own social theories in organising his corporation of Val-des-Bois.

[1] Léon Harmel, *Manuel d'une corporation chrétienne, cinquième partie; De la corporation chrétienne ouvrière de Val-des-Bois.* See, also, in the appendix to this volume, the numerous regulations for the working, the economic life, the administration and organisation of the corporation of Val-des-Bois.

After the misfortunes of 1870, the Catholic industrialists of the North of France gave much attention at their annual congresses to the social question. Guided by the example of M. Féron Vrau, they introduced nuns into their industrial establishments, not with a view to their supervising the labour of the workers, but in order that they might watch over the morals of their people with that delicacy of tact not to be expected from lay superintendents or directors. Thus was founded, through the initiative of the Bishop of Grenoble, the congregation of the *Petites sœurs de l'ouvrier*, whose mission it is to restore the influence of Christian domestic life among the populations employed in the large manufactories.[1]

The *Association catholique des patrons du nord de la France* held its first meetings in September, 1884, under the presidency of Abbé Fichaux. The industrialists who took part in these meetings were unanimous in recognising that the workman is not a mere material force to be used up and then cast aside, taking only into account the immediate wants of production, and they further agreed that it was necessary that masters should interest themselves in their work people and treat them with greater care. Thus was founded, on the model of Val-des-Bois, the Confraternity of *Notre Dame de l'Usine*, which spread most rapidly at Roubaix and Tourcoing. Other free corporations were founded at Lille and in many of the industrial centres of the North of France. The Catholic industrialists of the North, though by no means partisans of Socialistic doctrines—to which, indeed, they are radically opposed — yet admit that Individualism is contrary to the laws of Christianity. But they do not consider that the State can efficiently remedy the evils of industrial society. Consequently, without denying that the State may exercise a very great influence, they maintain that nothing can be effected without a most necessary reform of morals. Once the breath of Christianity has passed into the souls of the people, the

[1] Whoever desires ample information on this subject should read the document B in Claude Jannet's book, *Le socialisme d'état et la réforme sociale*, pp. 588-590; and the lecture by Père Felix, *Les petites sœurs de l'ouvrier*, given at the Madeleine, Paris; published by Zèqui, 1883.

workman will become more thrifty, more resigned, more trustful, and, on the other hand, the master will lead a less luxurious life, and neglect less his duties. Nevertheless, they do not, on this account, consider that the State should not interfere, and by means of wise laws protect the health and integrity of the workman, and they recognise the necessity for international labour laws.

Without in the least denying that the *Association catholique des patrons du nord de la France* has, in a practical sense, contributed to a certain extent to the welfare of the working classes in the districts in which it exercises an influence, we must, however, confess that it follows an order of ideas diametrically opposed to those of the Catholic Socialists, and limits its action to a very narrow sphere.[1]

The Catholic members of the French bar are almost all disciples of Claude Jannet. According to the resolutions taken at the Congress at Arras, in 1890, they maintain that, with regard to the labour question, the State is merely a subsidiary power. Consequently, the remuneration of labour can only be determined by the law of supply and demand. Masters are in no wise accountable for the insufficiency of wages, nor can they be held answerable for accidents happening under circumstances beyond their control, nor can they be held morally bound to attempt an insurance system at their own expense. Much less can a rate of indemnities for accidents be established. Masters have, moreover, a right to form coalitions

[1] In order to form an exact idea of the association, consult the *Déclaration des industriels catholiques au congrès de Lille en* 1885, Lille, 1886; Abbé Fichaux, *Commentaire à la déclaration*, etc., Lille, 1886; *Adresse des industriels catholiques du nord à notre Saint Père le pape Léon XIII.*, Lille, Ducoulombier, 1888; M. Féron Vrau, *La corporation chrétienne de St. Nicolas*, Lille, 1889; *Compte-rendu de l'assemblée des catholiques du diocèse de Reims*, 1887; Abbé Fichaux, *Rapport sur la question sociale*, Grenoble. 1889; Congrès de Lille, *Commission des œuvres sociales*, Lille, 1889; *Statut du syndacat de l'industrie turquennoise*, Congrès catholique de Lille, séance du vendredi 30 novembre, 1888, Lille, Lefort, 1889; *Compte-rendu de l'année* 1887-88, Lille, Ducoulombier, 1889; *Réponse des industriels chrétiens du nord au questionnaire de l'Œuvre des cercles*, Tourcoing, 1890; Fristot, *Une tentative d'organisation ouvrière*, etc.; C. Jannet, *Le socialisme d'état*, etc., chap. viii., etc.

at will, and even raise and lower the price of commodities artificially; the prohibition of such coalitions by the Penal Code, Art. 419, is unjust. Compulsory insurance, which is contrary to the principles of natural law, is in reality an absolutely ruinous utopia. As agriculture, industry and commerce do not constitute social functions, the State can have no virtual control over private property, much less can it interfere to regulate production. The evil from which we are suffering does not arise from liberty, but from the imperfect manner in which liberty is exercised.[1] These conclusions, which are not quite just, differ from the theories of Socialism in the same degree as those of the school led by Count de Mun resemble them.

Thus, the economic doctrines, the aspirations and conclusions of the various schools of French Catholics are anything but in harmony. Between Count de Mun, who is full of enthusiasm for a system which he refuses to admit as an outcome of State Socialism, but which is in reality the most advanced form of State Socialism, with a touch of Catholic and Legitimist varnish, and the odious and bourgeois egoism of the Catholic jurisconsults, whose conclusions are, for the most part, not even in accordance with Christian morality, there is, at least, as much difference as between a Socialist and a Conservative, or, better still, between a Socialist and a Conservative who admits liberty only in economic relations, but will not hear of it in politics.

The form of Catholic Socialism taught by Count de Mun has passed through three distinctly different periods. In the first the *Œuvre* maintained the absolute necessity of a return to the guild system; in the second, after the approval of the law on syndicates, it sought to bring about the development of mixed syndicates; finally, in the third, with the hope of restoring the establishment of guilds, it has supported the necessity for profound economic reforms on the part of the State, thus accentuating its tendency towards State Socialism.[2]

[1] See the account of the "Congrès des jurisconsultes catholiques sur la législation chrétienne du travail," in the *Revue catholique des institutions et du droit*, November, 1889.

[2] See De Haussonville, "Socialisme d'état et socialisme chrétien," in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15th June, 1890. On the views of the French

Notwithstanding the frequency of strikes, Socialism in Belgium is equally far removed from the violence of French Socialism and the doctrinal tendencies of German Socialism.

If there is any country in the world where Socialism is of a possibilist and practical nature, that country is Belgium. Anseele, Volders, and Beltrand are practical men, little given to theoretical statements, and truly desirous of the workman's welfare.

The Belgian Socialists limit their demands to the substitution of co-operation for industries carried on by individual capital, and the substitution for suffrage based on the tax-roll of universal suffrage.[1]

With the exception of Liége, which is a true hot-bed of Anarchical doctrines, the rest of Belgium remains attached to the co-operative theory, and the Socialist leaders themselves carry on, for the most part, an active and zealous propaganda in favour of co-operation.

Nevertheless, the Catholic social movement in Belgium is much less wide-spread and intense than in France, though it also began very early.

As early as 1846, François Huet, one of the most eminent spiritualist philosophers in Belgium, basing his principles of sociology on the ideals of Christianity, but mistrusted by the Christians, who did not consider him sufficiently Christian, and little loved by the Socialists, who accused him of not being sufficiently Socialist, in his book on the *Règne social du Chrétienisme*, anticipated by a long date the theories of modern Catholic Socialists.

Adopting for his motto the three principles of the Revolution of 1789: "Liberty, equality, fraternity," he logically arrived at the conclusions of Socialism. Men being equal in right, they ought, according to Huet, to be able to develop them-

Catholic economists with regard to the social question see also the two remarkable articles by Charles Clément, "Les économistes catholiques français et la question sociale," in the numbers for July and August (1892) of the *Revue Générale*.

[1] De Wyzewa, *Le mouvement socialiste en Europe*, p. 182. Paris: Perrin, 1892.

selves freely ; but property is an essential condition of liberty, hence property is a natural right, and as such belongs to all men. "Either words have no meaning, or to place property among natural rights implies that the original title of investiture to the goods of the earth is the quality of humanity; that the quality of humanity creates of itself an immediate right to a determinate part in these goods, original property, which becomes for everybody the source, the foundation, and the means of acquiring all the rest. It is the undeniable consequence of the right to live. Is not this right equal for all, and do not all stand equally in need of the means of living? Has not every man made in the image of God a right to this original patrimony, to this magnificent gift of God? By reason of his place in the series of human generations, has not every man also a right to the hereditary capital, the joint acquisition of men? Nobody ought to live at another's expense. Every man who has not forfeited it has a right to live free, has a right that his subsistence, his labour, should not depend on the good-will of others, and, however free he may be in his person, if he does not possess by natural right any sum, any capital, if he is not a proprietor, by virtue of his being a man and a worker, he can produce, he can live, only by permission of his fellow-men, and must fall into a true state of *real slavery*. It has been said, and cannot be sufficiently repeated : property is an absolute condition of liberty. Why, then, instead of a general right, convert it into a monstrous privilege? Why refuse to recognise in humanity the first, the most sacred title to the possession of things?"[1] These principles led Huet to the most advanced Socialism of Equality, having many affinities with that of Colin. Less practical than those who, after his death, continued his work in England and America, Huet proposes that every year a division should be

[1] In support of this thesis Huet cites many Christian authors. Amongst others Chateaubriand has written: "Without individual property nobody is free. Whoever has no property cannot be independent. Property is nothing else but liberty." *Mémoires d'outre tombe.* "Wages are only a prolonged slavery." *Essais historiques sur la littérature anglaise*, vol. ii., p. 392.

made of the patrimonial property left ownerless through decease; all should have a share in the division. Hereditary succession should be abolished, and the right of devising by will allowed; each person can dispose only of property acquired by his own labour. In this manner social capital would be incessantly fed from an inexhaustible source, and the general patrimony would in time be composed of all the old patrimonial property, and of all the accumulated capital of each generation, which could only once be transmitted as a gift. In fact, we have here a very rude scheme of social organisation, which the eminent spiritualist philosopher never succeeded in defining clearly, or in stating with much lucidity.[1]

However, the Belgian Catholics have always been, and are still, far removed from Huet's views. M. Périn, their ablest economist, not only differs radically in his social doctrines from the Catholics of Germany, Austria, and France, but is a warm champion of economic liberty, and the most bitter enemy of all forms of Socialism.

The Belgian Catholic party, which represents the great majority of the country, and is now the arbiter of the Government and of almost all the provincial administrations, gave little, if any, attention to the social question until 1880. After that date, owing to the powerful initiative of the Bishop of Liége, and the new tendencies spread among the clergy by the French propaganda, Catholic Socialism penetrated slowly, and not without encountering many difficulties, into Belgium also.

Monsignor Dontcloux, Bishop of Liége, by stimulating the action of the Catholic congresses, which he patronised and guided, was able to make Liége one of the principal centres of irradiation of the Catholic social movement.

The Belgian Catholics have now a powerful labour federation: co-operative societies, societies of employers, a society under the name of St. Raphael (the patron saint of emigrants), etc. There is not a Catholic town or village in all Belgium which has not its Catholic association; these associa-

[1] See Laveleye, *Le socialisme contemporain*, pp. 236-239, edition already quoted.

tions are all linked together so as to form one vast federation, of which the actual leader is De Wœste.

The *Union des patrons en faveur des ouvriers*, which was likewise founded through the initiative of the Bishop of Liége, has for its object the study of all questions affecting the religious, moral, and economic improvement of the labouring classes, and to propagate the application of the most efficacious means for obtaining this improvement. The association publishes a *Bulletin mensuel*, and has succeeded in bringing together more than two hundred industrialists.[1]

The *Gildes des Ambachten*, or *Gildes des metiers*, are daily increasing in number with the most astonishing rapidity, These are encouraged by the Liége committee, and receive kindly support from the Belgian Ministry,[2] and are, above all, favoured by the wonderful spirit of association traditional among the Flemish people. Nor do the Catholics neglect the co-operative societies for production as well as distribution, which are very numerous, especially in the western districts.[3]

De Wœste, the leader of the Catholic party, who holds a conspicuous position in Parliament and in the country, while admitting that a great part of the tendencies and claims of the so-called Socialists are unjust, considers the *laissez-faire* doctrines absurd. According to him, this false optimistic formula leads us to inaction and self-deception. But this principle, which, logically speaking, should dispose him towards the theories of the interventionists, does not weaken his faith in Liberal economics. And even on the subject of the protection of labour

[1] See the *Travaux du congrès catholique des œuvres sociales réuni à Liége en* 1886 *et* 1887, Liége, Dumarteau, 1887; *Travaux du congrès des œuvres sociales de Charleroi*, 1888; and the memorandum by H. Doat, *Utilité des unions des patrons, et moyen de les propager*, submitted at the Congress of Liége, September, 1890.

[2] See *L'économiste catholique, bulletin de la fédération belge des œuvres ouvrières catholiques*, published at Brussels. The Belgian Ministry is trying to pass a bill on trade syndicates, which has substantial affinities with the French bill of the 21st March, 1884.

[3] V. Falgan, *Les institutions économiques fondées par l'abbé Henri van den Dreisch à Iseghen et à Taghem*, Paris, Bureau du crédit mutuel et populaire; Lagasse, *Les sociétés co-opératives*, Paris, Guillaumin, 1886.

he declares himself opposed to State intervention, considering the excesses of the present evils preferable to the excesses of Cæsarism.[1]

In an elaborate memorial presented at the Catholic Congress of Liége, in 1890, Abbé Pottier, a Catholic of much worth, has studied with care *Ce qu'il y a de légitime dans les revendications ouvrières.*

According to Abbé Pottier, wage is a payment incumbent on the employer in virtue of the contract stipulated by the workman for the hire of his labour. If the master pays less than the price agreed upon he naturally violates commutative justice, and is bound by law to pay the price that has been freely stipulated. But does the fulfilment of the contract, however free it may have been, satisfy justice? Or was the contract not preceded by hard conditions which ought to modify it? There should be no doubt on the matter. A contract for wages is a hire of labour, a species of reciprocal, binding contract, a barter: the workman furnishes his labour, the master gives the wage. If such a contract is to satisfy the demands of justice, it is absolutely necessary that there should exist an objective equivalence between the things exchanged. Hence the Liberal economic doctrine which considers that the obligation of paying labour more than the price agreed upon constitutes an offence to the rights of property and against liberty, is false.

But who can be judge of this objective equivalence? Who can determine the value of labour, and in such a manner that the sentence pronounced should constitute a standard by which to measure the justice of the price? If the authorities do not fix the price of labour the objective equivalence must be judged by workers and masters together. This common estimate, unlike a legal price, cannot be mathematically determined. There will always exist a maximum and a minimum wage. The objective reason of the value of labour consists

[1] See the address delivered by De Wœste at the Congress of Liége, 1890, and published in the *Gazette de Liége*, 8th September, 1890. However, De Wœste, in all his public speeches, shows that he does not in the least understand the new social movement, and that he is but a mediocre politician.

precisely in the utility of the workman's labour. The greater the utility accruing from labour the higher will its price be in the common estimation. The valuation of the utility of labour is influenced by supply and demand. The greater is the number of those who offer the means of procuring a commodity in proportion to those who wish to acquire it, the greater must be the number of those who cannot be allowed to furnish it. Now, if they wish to be favoured in the choice made, those who offer their labour must lower their price. The value of things depends on their fitness to be exchanged. Evidently the things for which the workman wishes to exchange his labour are, in the main, those destined for subsistence. And it is for this reason that, when of equal utility, trades requiring a long apprenticeship are the best remunerated.

It is, likewise, for this reason that labour performed by women exclusively, though of equal utility, is less remunerated than the labour of men; woman is almost always dependent on her parents or her husband for a great part of her expenses. Let us suppose that certain kinds of labour, now performed by women exclusively, were allotted to men; we would see that this fact alone would suffice to raise the wages considerably in the common estimation.

The net profit accruing to a contractor cannot be just unless, after deducting the interest on the capital employed and the expenses of management, the workman has received a wage sufficient for his maintenance.

Justice demands that the proletarian workman, who furnishes all the labour that can be reasonably expected of him in any branch of industry realising a net profit, should at least be paid a wage equivalent to the necessaries of life. If the great mass of proletarian workmen enrich those for whom they work, yet do not receive in return for their labour what is sufficient to live upon, we must admit that only the greatest injustice can appear to legitimise such a system.

Here, naturally, there cannot and should not be any question of charity, but of justice. Charity is admissible only in enterprises involving loss; beyond that, the question of wage is a duty imposed by justice.

Theologians, beginning with St. Thomas Aquinas, have but one argument to legitimise the right of property; that is, the right which every man has to subsist, and to provide for his own future subsistence and that of his family, and the right to appropriate to his own use not only the fruit of his labour, but also the soil from which he derives it. Consequently, the foundation of the right of property is originally nothing else than the right to subsistence which every man possesses. If we refuse the workman his only means of subsistence, we must then admit that a great portion of humanity has no right to subsist.

The Liberal economists, who admit that in the hire of labour all justice consists in the convention between the parties, subject only to the law of supply and demand, are in opposition to Christian morality and natural law.

Nor, on the other hand, are the assumptions of the Malthusians less immoral. Even supposing that labour had no other scope beyond the production of wealth, this argument alone would suffice to prove what a ruinous system it is to employ the workman without furnishing him the means of continuing his race on a large scale. It consequently becomes necessary, in order to estimate the minimum wage to which the workman has a right, to take for basis the average number of children resulting from the real fecundity of marriages contracted among the class in which the workman lives.

Labour is, according to Abbé Pottier, "the means given by God to the mass of humanity to procure the things necessary for existence in accordance with natural law. . . . Consequently, when the total and indispensable sum of labour furnished by the workmen to any form of industry compensates the various factors of the industry to the full amount of their rights, the workman also has a right to earn by his collaboration sufficient to live on here below."

The workman's wage should also include all that is necessary to provide for his existence according to his condition and the claims of human dignity.[1]

[1] See the memorial by Abbé Pottier, *Ce qu'il y a de légitime dans les revendications ouvrières*, presented at the Congress of Liége, 1890.

These theories, frequently uncertain and contradictory, which should incline Abbé Pottier to admit the right to labour, the limitation of wages according to the various industries, profits, etc., do not, however, lead him to accept these conclusions which are the necessary outcome of the premises he lays down.

From Victor Brants' books it would appear that he is much more a follower of the Liberal School than a Catholic Socialist, yet he accepts in a general way the principle of legal limitation of the maximum working day. However, he would have this limitation brought about, not through the action of the State, but through the initiative of the masters and the action of co-operative syndicates and congresses of arbitrators, taking into account the degree of compressibility of each industry and of all forms of labour, the nature of the industry itself, the technical difficulties, and the averages of the workmen and industrialists. The limitations and restrictions would consequently be so numerous, and of such a nature, as to render the principle itself, if not altogether impossible, certainly most difficult to apply.[1]

But it was at the last Catholic Congress at Malines that the Belgian Catholics clearly showed that though they possess great ability in leading the electoral masses, they are, nevertheless, most inexpert in matters of social economy.

After all the orators had delivered rhetorical tirades against Socialism—which, to some, appeared to be the negation of God ; to others, the enemy of Christianity ; to others, finally, the scourge of society—M. Dumonceau rose to protest indignantly against so many vain assertions. "I need not tell you," he said, "whether I am a Socialist or not. I shall merely say, before condemning Socialism, study it better. You are behindhand. It was not until the other day that you gave any thought to the questions raised by Socialism, on which the Socialists have the merit of having been the first to

[1] V. Brants, "La journée de huit heures dans le travail industriel," in the *Revue Générale*, September, 1891.

throw light. It is because you neglected this mission that God has passed it on to others." [1]

And as a clamour of protestations arose from all the benches, the orator immediately added: *Vous avez peur du mot!*—You are afraid of the word!

A most singular discussion then began, in the course of which things were said which do not even merit to be reported, and which was brought to a close by a certain M. Helleputte, who asserted that the Catholics want Democracy, but do not want Socialism. [2] "Christian Socialism," concluded the said M. Helleputte, "would be a form of Socialism admitting those principles which all Socialists reject."

And the congress burst out into frantic applause at this idea, expressed with a vigour and precision of language worthy of Joseph Proudhon.

The Belgian Catholics are, generally speaking, much less venturesome than the other Catholics of Central Europe. Living in a wealthy country, where the conditions of labour are singularly good, being able to count upon large forces, and to dispose of the Government, they feel less the necessity of boldly entering the field and attacking the social question without fear or prejudice. It is now several years since the Catholics came into power, and they have not shown that their economic views are larger than those of the Liberals. Though in 1886 they carried out an inquiry which resulted in rendering evident the abuses and infamies of Industrialism, even in the most flourishing cities of the kingdom, the Ministry only utilised the enormous Catholic majority to vote the laws against drunkenness, which do not remedy the evil; the laws on the insequestrability of wages, which change nothing; the laws on the consulate of industry and labour and on working-men's dwellings, which are of but small efficacy; and finally, the laws for protecting the labour of women and children—none of which can bear comparison with the social

[1] A. Nyssens, "La quatrième assemblée générale des Catholiques à Malines," in the *Revue Générale*, pp. 738-739.

[2] A. Nyssens, *loc. cit.*

laws of Germany and Switzerland, where, however, the Catholic party only forms a strong minority. [1]

[1] On the social laws of Belgium see the study by C. Favre in the *Revue d'économie politique*, January, 1892. At the Berlin Congress the Belgian representatives, sent by a Catholic minister, and all of whom belonged to the political party, were just those whose views were to us large and democratic.

CHAPTER XI.

PROGRESS OF CATHOLIC SOCIALISM IN ENGLAND, AMERICA, SPAIN, AND ITALY.

English Socialism—Radical Socialism and its Want of Success—The Socialists and the Church—Progress of Catholicism—English Christian Socialism—Cardinal Manning and his Social Theories—Cardinal Manning's Socialism: Reduction and Limitation of Working Hours, Limitation of Minimum Wage, War against the Abuses of Capital—The Right to Labour and the Right to Subsistence, according to Cardinal Manning—Cardinal Manning and the Dockers' Strike—Monsignor Lynch and the Right to Existence—State Socialism of Monsignor Bagshawe — Necessity for the Regulation of Labour—Mr. Devas — The Catholic Clergy and Agrarian Socialism in Ireland—American Socialism—Catholicism in the United States—Socialism of the American Clergy—The Knights of Labour and the Abolition of the Wage System—History, Organisation, and Vicissitudes of the Knights of Labour—Cardinal Gibbons Saves the Knights of Labour from Excommunication—Henry George Admitted by the Clergy, as not Contrary to Religion—Father MacGlynn and the Labour Party—Monsignor Ireland and Modern Democracy—Character of Spanish Socialism: its Violence and Tendencies—Lack of Moderation in the Clergy—Feeble Efforts of Catholic Economists—Condition of the Clergy in Italy—The Italian Clergy and the Aspirations of the Papacy—Position of Catholics in Italy—Padre Curci and his Social Theories—Attempts at Christian Socialism—Padre Liberatore—Cardinal Capecelatro and Monsignor Bonomelli—Other Attempts—Italian Socialism assumes an Anti-Religious Character.

SOCIALISM spread much less rapidly in England than in Germany, and also with much less intensity. The religious tendencies of English workmen, their little aptitude for the theoretical abstractions and more or less chimerical dreams of the new Socialistic schools, together with the trades unions and other large associations which, in bringing the workmen into contact, govern them with inexorable discipline, leaving them but a very limited liberty of action, have, up to the present, formed an obstacle to the development

of Revolutionary Socialism.[1] If the religious Socialism begun on such large bases by Kingsley,[2] if the movement in favour of land nationalisation, the remote origins of which we must trace back to Thomas Spence, who lived in the second half of the last century,[3] but which only recently eceived a powerful impulse from the works of Alfred R. Wallace; if the Agrarian Socialism of Mr. Chamberlain,[4] meets with ever-increasing success, the Democratic Socialist movement spreads slowly, and encounters innumerable obstacles.[5] The champions of the Social Democratic Federation, such as Hyndman, Champion, Williams, Helen Taylor; and the Ultra-Socialists, such as William Morris, Dr. Aveling, Mrs. Eleanor Marx Aveling, find an insurmountable barrier to their propaganda in the very character of the English workman.

The trades unions have become imbued with Socialistic doctrines; at the last congress at Newcastle they even went so far as to accept the legal determination of the working day. But there is nothing in England that can be compared to the enormous mass of social democracy in Germany. For some time past, however, a vague sentiment of alarm and uneasiness has been making itself felt, which unconsciously urges on even the higher classes towards Socialism. Indeed, in no part of the world are the middle classes so much inclined towards Socialism as in England, where eminent men of science,

[1] See Winterer, *Trois années de l'histoire du socialisme contemporain*, pp. 20-23, Paris, 1882; *Le danger social, on deux années de socialisme en Europe et en Amérique*, p. 18 and following. Paris: Poussielgue, 1885. On the actual state of Political Economy in England, and on the new Anti-Liberal tendencies, see the very able study by G. Cohn in the *Jahrbücher für Gesetzgebung, Verwaltung, und Volkswirtschaft von Schmoller*, p. 605 and following, 1889.

[2] On the evangelical socialist movement in England, see Lujo Brentano's *Die christlich-sociale Bewegung in England*, p. 124. Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot, 1883.

[3] See Hyndman, *Historical Basis of Socialism*, etc., p. 448.

[4] See Arthur Raffalovich, *Le socialisme agraire de M. Chamberlain.* Paris: Guillaumin, 1886.

[5] See W. C. Crofts, *Socialism of the Street in England.* London: Liberty and Property Defence League, 1888.

dignitaries of the Church, and profound thinkers tend more and more towards Socialistic doctrines. In no other country does Socialism count in its ranks men of science like Wallace, poets like Morris, and a whole legion of eminent men and talented thinkers.

The Catholics of England constitute a very strong minority, which tends continually to increase and multiply. Thus, while at the beginning of this century there were little more than 120,000 in England and Scotland together, they numbered, according to the last census, 1,058,000 in England, and not less than 320,000 in Scotland, which represents seventeen per cent. of the entire population of the kingdom.[1]

Protestantism was forced upon England in the most odious and violent manner. The traditions of the Catholic Church throughout the United Kingdom are consequently democratic.[2] The most eminent economists of the Liberal school, and even Mr. Hyndman, the Socialist, do not attempt to deny that the

[1] See the *Association Catholique*, p. 120 and following, 15th March; and the *Annuario di statistica*, anno iii., p. 236, Milan, Vallardi, 1880. The figures cited were, however, collected by Catholic societies, which often tend to exaggerate the progress of Catholicism; they diminish greatly in value if we take into account Irish immigration and the total increase of the population. According to Dr. G. Blundell Longstaff (*Studies in Statistics*, London, Ed. Stanford, 1891) Irish immigration is enough to explain the increase in the number of Catholics:—

IRISH IMMIGRANTS.

	ENGLAND.	SCOTLAND.
1841-1850 ...	311,500 ...	—
1851-1860 ...	193,800 ...	—
1861-1870 ...	81,700 ...	44,900
1871-1880 ...	108,700 ...	53,600

It is, however, very difficult to ascertain what notable progress, if any, has been made in Catholic propaganda, for the reason that in the official census in England and Scotland no inquiry was made as to the religion professed.

[2] ["The old English Catholic families have generally been Conservative," and, indeed, continue for the most part to be so, together with a large portion of the clergy and the wealthy and well-to-do middle class and trades people; it is *safer* and more convenient. "The *poor* Irish immigrants, who are Catholics, are democratic, and they now contribute to the bulk of Catholics in England and Scotland."—Trans.]

violent suppression of Catholicism and the confiscation of the property of the monasteries, in which the poor had ever found a kindly welcome and the means of sustenance, were among the principal causes of the development of pauperism.[1]

In England, as in all countries where they form but a minority of the population, the Catholics, in the matter of social reform and the claims of labour, and in opposition to the propaganda carried on by the Protestants and Liberals, are bound by the very necessity of things to study the social question with impartial judgment and ample views. Whereas, in countries in which Catholicism is the religion of the State, as in Italy and Spain, and where the Protestant denominations do not succeed in spreading, the clergy do not feel it necessary to take up the social question with the same ardour as in those countries in which the Catholics form but a minority, as in England and Germany, where, in order to retain the attachment of the masses, the Catholic clergy are obliged to recognise the claims and wants of the people, and frequently even to follow the popular tendencies. Thus we see that while in France and Austria the majority of the clergy may almost be said to keep aloof from the Catholic Socialist movement, in those countries where religious contests between Catholics and Protestants are still alive, and where each of the various religious confessions tends to develop to the detriment of the others, as in Germany, England, Switzerland, and the United States, the clergy almost invariably accept a great part of Socialistic theories, and admit the legitimacy of popular claims.

The Catholic bishops in England being obliged to contend with the Socialism of the Anglican clergy, some of whom, like

[1] See the fourth chapter of this book. On the tendencies of Catholicism see also Fairbairn, "Anglo-Catholicism—the Old and the New," in the *Contemporary Review*, March, 1890. "Protestant individualism," writes the Socialist, Sidney Olivier, "shattered the Catholic Church, founded the modern land system upon its confiscated estates, destroyed the mediæval machinery of charity and education, and in religion rehabilitated the devil and the doctrines of original sin, and the damnable danger of reason and good works." See *The Fabian Essays*, p. 125. London: Walter Scott.

the Rev. Stewart Headlam, have already gone the length of accepting land nationalisation, have been impelled by the necessities of the religious struggle to interest themselves in the social question.

They are favoured in this, not only by their democratic traditions, but also by their position with respect to Government and the wealthy industrial middle class. As the Catholic Church in England is maintained by the voluntary contributions of the faithful, it possesses neither the immense lands nor the great wealth of the Church of England. It consequently stands in an independent position as regards Government. And while the Anglican clergy cannot, on account of their semi-official position, take any initiative against Government, the Catholic Church, in opposition to Government, has for more than a century supported, with most wonderful energy, the rights of the Irish Catholics against the inhuman violence of Protestant landlords.[1] In like manner, during the dockers' strike, the Protestant clergy were seen to stand aloof, while the late Cardinal Manning, the eminent Archbishop of Westminster, boldly defended the rights of the poor dockers.

Cardinal Manning, whose austere life and elevated character gave him a great prestige even among his adversaries, had already long before that time fully arrived at the conclusions of Socialism.

On the 4th May, 1890, the day of the great labour demonstration in England in favour of the eight-hours movement, several Socialist banners bore, painted side by side with the portrait of Marx, that of Cardinal Manning, whose popularity among the London workmen increased from day to day.[2]

"We have been afflicted," wrote the late Cardinal of

[1] On the Catholic movement in England, see the article by Von Vogelsang, "Katholische Nationalökonomie in England," in the *Oesterreichische Monatsschrift für Gesellschaft, Wissenschaft, und Volkswirtschaft*, pp. 417-422, Sept., 1879.

[2] See the article by De Haussonville, "Socialisme d'état et socialisme chrétien," in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, p. 804, 15th June, 1890.

Westminster, "by an exaggeration of Individualism, and the next century will show that human society is greater and nobler than all that which is merely individual. This doctrine, which has its foundation in the laws of nature and of Christianity, is accused of Socialism by the frivolous and the impetuous, as well as by the capitalists and the rich. But the future will call forth into the light of reason the social state of the world of labour. We shall then see on what laws the Christian society of humanity rests."[1]

As early as 1874, in a famous lecture on "The Rights and Dignity of Labour," delivered before a large meeting of artisans and workmen,[2] in the industrial city of Leeds, Cardinal Manning boldly attacks the social question. Labour, the origin of all wealth and prosperity, is not only the primary law of our State, but is the law of the development of mind and body. In proportion to the development of labour, humanity advances, production increases, the number of inventions augments. Thus we have a continual accumulation of physical, intellectual, and mechanical activity. Every honest labourer has consequently a right to respect for the dignity of his state, and there is nothing more undignified than for a man to think there is nobody of higher stature, morally or intellectually, than himself. If the State protects the rights of individual property, it must necessarily protect the rights of labour, since nothing is more strictly his own than a man's labour. Liberal economists exclude any duty, on the part of the State, to intervene in the relations between capital and labour, but there is a law of equity that renders this intervention necessary and binding. "If," said the cardinal, "the great end of life were to multiply yards of cloth and cotton twist, and if the glory of England consists, or consisted, in multiplying, without stint or limit, these articles and the like at the lowest possible price, so as to undersell all the nations of the world, well, then, let us go on. But if the

[1] Letter to a collaborator of the *XX^me Siècle* of Marseilles, p. 678, November-December, 1890.

[2] Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, *The Rights and Dignity of Labour*, p. 24. London: Burns & Oates, 1887.

domestic life of the people be vital above all ; if the peace, the purity of homes, the education of children, the duties of wives and mothers, the duties of husbands and of fathers be written in the natural law of mankind, and if these things be sacred, far beyond anything that can be sold in the market, then I say, if the hours of labour resulting from the unregulated sale of man's strength and skill shall lead to the destruction of domestic life, to the neglect of children, to the turning of wives and mothers into living machines, and of fathers and husbands into—what shall I say, creatures of burden?—I will not use any other word—who rise up before the sun and come back when it is set, wearied, and able only to take food and lie down to rest ; the domestic life of men exists no longer, and we dare not go on in this path." [1]

The constant accumulation of wealth in the hands, and to the profit, of certain classes and certain individuals cannot go on. The power of capitalism is now grown so enormous and so dangerous that one fact alone will be sufficient to give an idea of it. Among hundreds of strikes that have taken place in England, only five or six have been adjusted in favour of the labourers. The dependence of workers is so complete, "the starvation and sufferings of their families, composed of feeble women and children, so intolerable and imperative, that the conflict between living capital and dead capital is of the most unequal ; and free contract, on which Political Economy prides itself, may be said not to exist ".[2]

Cardinal Manning further recognised the right that all men have to get work, and consequently to be supported. In certain famous letters to the *Times* he entered the lists against the so-called benefits of Liberal Economics, strengthening his arguments by texts quoted from the Scriptures, and in a memorable article, published in the *Fortnightly Review*, he maintained, as do all Socialists, the right even to theft, as the

[1] Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, *The Rights and Dignity of Labour*, pp. 21 and 22. London : Burns & Oates, 1887.

[2] See the letter of Cardinal Manning to the *Tablet*, reproduced by Boudignon in the article "Le clergé et la question sociale," in the *Université Catholique*, p. 124 and following, 15th November, 1889.

necessary complement to the right to existence, in all countries in which the State has not established the right to assistance.[1]

As Monsignor Lynch, Archbishop of Toronto, expressed himself in a celebrated letter to the editor of the *Chicago Times*, the opinion held by Cardinal Manning on the right to steal in cases of extreme necessity, is in perfect accordance with the morality of the Gospel: "I will answer your inquiry in a few words, being much pressed for time. In the first place, I endorse every word of the proposition laid down by his Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, and I am astonished that there can be any second opinion about it. A man is bound by the first law of nature to preserve his own life, and the man who prevents him saving his life 'murders him'—I quote the words of St. Augustin. He murders him. A man in shipwreck grasps a plank belonging to another. The man who takes that plank from him (unless to save his own life) drowns him, for he grievously fails in charity, whose primary law is, 'As you would that men should do to you do you also to them in like manner'. His sin is the same who snatches bread from the mouth of a starving man. The starving poor in Ireland during the famine would have been perfectly justified in seizing on the food which was being conveyed to other countries to be sold for the benefit of the landlords. Archbishop M'Hale openly announced this primary law of nature. With respect to the maxim, 'Necessity knows no law,' I would say necessity has a law. That law is the first law of nature, the law which imposes on every man the obligation of saving his own life, if he can, and this law of necessity over-rules all positive enactments. No law deserves the name of law which prevents a man's saving his own life."[2]

Far from opposing, as did many other bishops, the labour demonstration of the 1st of May, Cardinal Manning showed

[1] See Gide, *Du rôle pratique du pasteur dans les questions sociales*, p. 19. Paris: Fischbacher, 1889. And Francis de Pressensé, "La transformation des idées économiques en Angleterre et en Allemagne," in the *Travaux de la deuxième assemblée générale de l'association protestante pour l'étude pratique des questions sociales*, p. 118. Paris: Fischbacher, 1890.

[2] See *Catholic Times*, 9th March, 1888.

how fully he understood its high social significance. "The absolute necessity," thus he wrote to Léon Harmel, "of raising up and easing the labour of men in such a way that their lives may be human lives, domestic lives, is a thing that nobody can doubt of. That the long hours of labour, not only for men, but also for women, and the uncertainty of a sufficient wage, render the domestic duties and affections impossible in our great industrial centres becomes evident of itself. Human society has no use for the imaginary 'economic man' of our political economists, but needs the human being in the full reality of the divine breath of life that animates him; it needs the man of the family of Adam, who was the first labourer, invested with all the sympathies, all the dignities of our human race."[1]

In an important letter addressed to Monsignor Dontcloux Bishop of Liége, the eminent Archbishop of Westminster carried his social programme to the utmost limits.

Political economy, as he expressed himself with much efficacy, should not take mere value and exchange for its object, but human life in all its needs and requirements. Labour is a social function, and should be taken into consideration as such. It is not possible to fix the number of hours of labour necessary for a man or woman every day till it has been determined how many hours a man should daily consecrate to his own person, and the time necessary for a woman to attend to the duties of domestic life. "To make labour and wage pass before the necessities of human and domestic life means the destruction of that order established by God and nature, and the ruin of human society in its original principle. The economy of industry is governed by the supreme moral law that determines, limits, and controls all its operations." At any rate, we may safely aver that for men employed in laborious work, like that of the mines, eight

[1] See the *XX^me Siècle*, p. 470, November-December, 1891. Several economists wrongly persist in giving no moral importance to the demonstration of the 1st of May. See the discussion between M. Maurice Block and myself, *Journal des Économistes*, October, 1891; and *Scuola Positiva*, of Naples, December, 1891.

hours' labour is more than enough, whereas a working day of ten hours is more than enough for men employed in lighter labour. Rest on Sundays, the prohibition of laborious and unwholesome occupations to girls, women and youths, the limitation of work hours for children under age and women, are all social duties, for which legislation should give a guarantee. But all this can give but scanty results till such time as a just and fitting measure for the regulation of profit and wages has been fixed, recognised and established, a measure by which all free contracts between capital and labour shall be controlled. Moreover, as all values employed in trade are subject to certain necessary fluctuations, all free contracts should be subjected to periodical revision every three or five years, in order to maintain them in equilibrium.[1]

To say that labour is a social function means to admit that the workman should be remunerated, not according to the law of supply and demand, but as all other functionaries are, according to the utility and importance of the social function with which he is charged. But to obtain this would it not, perhaps, be necessary to have recourse to collectivism?

Naturally, Cardinal Manning did not go so far as that.

In demanding a fixed minimum wage, the cardinal, like a great number of Catholic Socialists, had allowed himself to be misled by the false analogy between the determination of wages and that of interest. But if the State can exact that the capitalist shall not take more than five per cent. interest, and can adopt rigorous measures against transgressors, it is hard to see how it could use the same system for industrialists and employers, for whom the payment of the minimum fixed by the State would not infrequently mean ruin and bankruptcy.

Cardinal Manning was, in the main, a true Socialist. For not only did he recognise the necessity for the continual intervention of the State in the relations between capital and labour, and in a letter which was produced by all the papers of Europe,[2] praise the attempted international regulation of

[1] See the *Gazette de Liége*, 8th September, 1890.

[2] See the *Civiltà Cattolica*, 15th March, 1890. Cardinal Manning's letter was addressed to M. R. Fleicher.

labour made by Germany, but he carried his conclusions much further, admitting the necessity for the protection of workmen, the right to get work, the right to assistance, the necessity for the limitation of the hours of labour and for the determination of the minimum wage—most daring conclusions, against which the moderate Catholic parties of other countries did not fail to protest, and which the late Monsignor Freppel, in addressing the Catholic jurisconsults at Tours, repudiated as Socialistic.[1]

During his long and noble life Cardinal Manning did not shut himself up in dignified quiet in his archiepiscopal mansion in Westminster, but boldly entered the lists in defence of the rights of labour.

During the great dockers' strike, which threatened to create a famine in London, and caused a certain degree of panic, while the higher members of the Protestant clergy held themselves aloof, the cardinal was the first to take steps to promote a conciliation, and was able to be of no small aid to the cause of the dockers. It is a notorious fact that the men employed in the London Docks are extremely poor. They are divided into two large categories, one of which, the least numerous, works for a fixed pay, while the other is paid by the hour or by the day; the very nature of their occupation reduces the dock porters to a most insecure and uncertain position. The dockers are condemned to the sufferings of Tantalus, and daily see the wealth of London pass through their hands; they lead a most wretched life, forming one of the poorest classes in the great English metropolis. By assuming their defence at a moment when all London was in alarm at the proportions taken by the strike, the effects of which were not long in being felt, and rendered all the more necessary his mediation, of which he made use in the most generous manner in favour of this poorest class of labourers, Cardinal Manning added to his already great popularity among the working classes, and increased Catholic prestige among the people of England.[2]

[1] See *L'Anjou*, of Angers, 8th October, 1890.

[2] On the condition of the labourers in the docks, see the article by Beatrice Potter in the *Nineteenth Century*, July, 1888; A. Bertolini,

His Eminence Alfonso Capecelatro, Archbishop of Capua, an Italian cardinal, thus expressed, in an address on *La Questione Sociale e il Cattolicismo*, his high opinion of the late Cardinal Manning: "In all civilised Europe, and among Catholic Socialists (please allow me the use of the expression), I know of no one more daring than my very dear friend, Cardinal Manning. In action he is a most efficacious Socialist, and his conceptions are of the boldest; these he does not expound in many-paged books, but, like all men of great intelligence, and who are perfectly sure of themselves, he flashes them forth in a few brief, terse formulas, full of light, and free from all misty and inaccessible abstractions. Living in the midst of the free, tenacious English people, he has not hesitated to take the lead of Christian Socialism. Friend of the people, because friend of God, he outstrips all philanthropists, all modern economists and philosophers in the study of means to raise up the dignity of the masses, and to improve their condition. No man in England is so much loved and venerated by the working and agricultural classes; as a rule, he is most equally beloved among Catholics and Protestants, rich and poor."[1]

"Revista del socialismo," in the *Giornale degli economisti*, p. 160, January-April, 1890. On the noble part taken by Cardinal Manning in reconciling the dockers and the companies, see Schauer, "Die Philosophie des Londoner Docker Strikes," in the *Monatsschrift für christliche-social Reform*, pp. 125-144, third number for 1890; Un Ex-Ministro, "La chiesa e la questione sociale," in the *Nuova Antologia*, p. 230, 16th November, 1889. Unfortunately, the condition of the dockers is still deplorable. The men who, before the strikes, earned 1s. a day, have now 1s. 1d., but work an hour longer. See Gustave de Puynode, "Les revendications ouvrières," in the *Journal des économistes*, pp. 161-172, August, 1890. On the marked Socialistic tendencies of Cardinal Manning, see also the Earl of Wemyss, *Socialism in England*, 1880 *and* 1889, pp. xix.-xxi. London: Liberty and Property Defence League, 1890. Cardinal Manning also founded a *Catholic Total Abstinence League of the Cross*, the aim of which is to popularise the idea that even the *temperate* use of beer, wine, or spirits, etc., is unlawful. "The use, however, of these intoxicating drinks often leads to sin, and their abuse is one of the chief causes of the sin and misery in Great Britain and Ireland, and in other countries." See the *Constitution and Rules*, London, 1889.

[1] See the Catholic review, *La Campania Sacra*, of Capua, December 1890.

It would be difficult to imagine a better, nobler, more self-denying disposition than that of the late cardinal. When, in the beginning of 1892, he closed his eyes upon this life, there rose around his remains a cry of regret from all hearts for the saintly, intrepid, pure old man, whose long existence had all been given to the poor and the faith; there was not one noble soul but mourned the loss of him whom William Stead called "a very human saint".[1]

"We have been strangled," wrote Cardinal Manning some time before his death, "we have been strangled by an exaggerated form of Individualism, and the coming century will show that human society is grander and nobler than anything merely individual. This doctrine, which is founded on the law of nature and on Christianity, is taxed with Socialism by the frivolous and the impetuous, as by the capitalists and wealthy."[2]

The saintly old man was not spared to witness the agony of Individualistic doctrine, but he went to the grave with the firmest faith in the destinies of Socialism, closing his eyes to this life comforted by having seen the seeds of the coming regeneration sown before his death.

Certainly, in writing the history of the Catholic Church for the nineteenth century, the place of honour cannot but be assigned to Cardinal Manning as having been the first, perhaps, who dared to point out the true social mission of Catholicism, and most surely the only one who had the courage to dedicate his whole life to the research of the sole ideal—the Catholic Church as leader of Socialism and Democracy.[3]

[1] W. T. Stead, "Cardinal Manning," in the *Review of Reviews*, February, 1892.

[2] Letter of Cardinal Manning to the *XX^me Siècle*, November-December, 1890.

[3] Among the most remarkable studies on Cardinal Manning published at the time of his death, see W. Meynell, S. M. Sheldon Amos and B. Waugh, "Reminiscences of Cardinal Manning," in the *Contemporary Review*, February, 1892; J. Morris, "The Cardinal Archbishop," in the *Month*, February, 1892; G. Wilberforce, "Cardinal Manning," in the *Church of England, Nineteenth Century*, February, 1892; J. G.

Will the other Catholic bishops of England—that is to say, those who have accepted the great moral inheritance left them by Cardinal Manning—will they be willing and able to render themselves worthy of him? It will be difficult, however, for any member of the higher English clergy ever to exercise the same influence as the "Great Cardinal," whose imposing figure and apostolic labours can but gain in prestige as time passes.

The Very Reverend Herbert Vaughan, formerly Bishop of Salford, now Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, is a man of mild and affable disposition, and high intellectual culture. He takes but small interest in political matters, and will probably never join the ranks of militant Socialism; but if by Socialism we mean all reasonable and just efforts to alleviate the sufferings and improve the moral, material, and social state of the less fortunate classes of society, then indeed we may say that Cardinal Vaughan is a Socialist in the truest and most Christian sense of the word. While Bishop of Salford, where he was equally esteemed and beloved by all, he never tired of doing good to the people, interesting himself in everything that could contribute to their well-being, and using his influence with the public authorities to induce them to provide the working classes with wholesome dwellings and healthy, rational recreation. He exerted himself to the utmost in combating the vice of intemperance, and founded and encouraged a number of useful and charitable institutions, of which the Salford Catholic Protection and Rescue Society is the most important.[1]

Kenyon, "Cardinal Manning," in the *Catholic World*, March, 1892; Rev. W. Lockhart and S. E. Purcell, "Cardinal Manning," in the *Dublin Review*, March, 1892; etc.

[1] See E. Vlietinck, "La position sociale des catholiques en Angleterre," in the *Revue Générale*, June and July, 1892.

[It is impossible to close this portion of the chapter without mentioning the Very Rev. John Butt, Bishop of Southwark, who, in the course of the few years he has been at the head of this diocese, has done so much in the way of social work of the most useful and practical nature. It would be a difficult task to enumerate all he has accomplished, but the

The English Jesuits, like their brethren of France, resolutely exclude all State intervention, and maintain that in the conflict between capital and labour the State should remain neutral. Some years ago the Jesuit review, the *Lyceum*, proclaimed freedom of labour, blaming the propaganda carried on by Count de Mun.[1]

Monsignor Edward G. Bagshawe, the eminent Bishop of Nottingham, has, on the contrary, not only accepted the theories of Cardinal Manning, but has gone still further, and in several important pastoral letters and addresses delivered at Catholic congresses has formulated a thorough programme of State Socialism.

The condition of the poor, especially in many of the large centres, is, according to Monsignor Bagshawe, truly horrible;

following notice will give some slight idea of the nature of his efforts for the social welfare of those committed to his care.

The chief depôt of the Catholic Truth Society is in Westminster Bridge Road, Southwark. The object of this society is mainly religious, yet it has published many useful tracts on the temperance question, the living wage, the relations between employers and employed, etc.

Close by there is the Southwark Boys' Club and Gymnasium, where also classes are held nightly for the study of Latin, mathematics, modern languages, painting, drawing, and scientific subjects suitable to the capacity of the various students. By means of these many a lad is enabled to improve his social status.

Again, there is a laundry established which furnishes work to many of those applying at the cathedral for help; also sewing classes for girls.

One of the most successful of the works established in the diocese is the Needlework Guild. All the female members make two garments a year. These are collected in October, and distributed among the poor of the various parishes.

Among other institutions are two homes for boys, situated in Blackfriars Road, S.E. Boys are herein housed after they leave school, until such time as they are able to obtain employment sufficiently remunerative to allow them to live wholly on their own resources.

Bishop Butt has also established at least two orphanages for boys, and one or two for girls, besides a number of other useful works.

I am indebted for these details to the Rev. Edward Miller, C.C.—Trans.]

[1] See the interesting article, "State Organisation and Free Labour,' *Lyceum*, 1889.

all accounts given us of the state in which the poorest classes live are simply a description of the most heart-rending misery. This unnatural and un-Christian social condition is the outcome of modern civilisation, a civilisation based on the odious individualism of so-called political economy.[1]

Unless this state of society can be altered, it will continue to generate ever-increasing misery, and will undoubtedly lead us in the end to some fearful revolutionary catastrophe.

There can be no denying that the greater part of the modes of making money prevalent in modern times, by which enormous fortunes are accumulated in the hands of a few, while the multitudes are ever more and more impoverished, are based on injustice. No one can deny that there are whole classes of labourers who are obliged, in order to escape starvation, to work for wages which are manifestly unjust and iniquitous, while, on the other hand, capitalists and employers take advantage of their necessity to deprive the producers of the greater part of the just fruit of their toil. We daily hear the sacred rights of property loudly invoked by the wealthy classes, and every slightest infringement of these rights by the starving poor is punished by laws which are often inhumanly severe. But who is there to invoke those sacred rights in favour of the most sacred of all property, the hard-won earnings of the poor?[2] The wealthy classes speak of charity, but if they would only pay back to the poor what in strict justice they owe them, they would soon perceive that the sums so paid would be immensely larger than their so-called charities.

It is evident that a great accumulation of land and wealth gives to its owners the power to oblige poor men, through sheer necessity and to avoid starvation, to work for hard and unjust terms, and as wealth accumulates in fewer hands these terms tend to become harder and more insupportable, since the landlord or employer is in this manner enabled to appropriate to himself more and more of the profits of the tenant or labourer, by raising rents or lowering wages. Now, it is by no

[1] See Monsignor E. G. Bagshawe, *Mercy and Justice to the Poor, the True Political Economy*, pp. 1-13. London: Kegan Paul, 1885.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 7.

means true that there is no remedy against this tyrannous power of wealth except continual revolts, which destroy trade and give rise to many new injustices and incalculable misery. So-called political economy maintains that there is no other, since it is a first principle that capital and power of accumulation should be wholly unchecked, and that all business should be based on what it is pleased to term freedom of contract. "Christianity, on the contrary, tells us that these principles are untrue; and are only the selfish pretences of money-makers; that the poor and the helpless are not really free in their contracts, but need protection against the extortions of the rich; that labour has its just remuneration, and that its right to receive it should be protected by the community."[1]

If, on the contrary, these rights be denied, there is nothing to hold in check the enormous and often absolute power which accumulated land or wealth gives to rich owners of compelling the people to work for them on unjust terms, while they take to themselves the greater part of the profits of labour, arbitrarily refusing the labourers the right to live on the land, and so hold at their own caprice the lives and homes of multitudes. This is, unfortunately, the case in England, where the State, governing *exclusively* in the interest of the wealthy and land-owning classes, leaves this unjust and barbarous power almost uncontrolled.[2] "We see this in Ireland, where the rack-renting and evicting which has gone on for so many years, and still goes on with but little mitigation, has caused the ruin and death of millions, and most mischievously depopulated the country. We see relentless landlords drawing many thousands a year from estates on which they spend nothing, and on which the population producing that wealth lives in rags and starvation. We see great manufacturers buying up a whole trade, or department of a trade, to themselves, in order to ruin every smaller business of the kind. We see great shopkeepers adding shop to shop, and business to business, as though it were right and just that they alone should absorb everything, and force all competitors to become

[1] See Monsignor E. G. Bagshawe, as before cited p 17.
[2] *Ibid.*

their work people, so that they alone may be enriched. On the other hand, almost all those labourers (such as the poor needle-women), who are too poor and weak and helpless to combine against oppression, we see working day and night on shameful pittances, on which they live, without hope, a kind of living death."[1] The greater part of these odious practices are against that general justice which the State is bound to maintain, and the application of which should be ensured by means of proper legislation.

Can we call just a Government which allows that in a country like Ireland, while the peasantry languish in the direst misery, depending on the caprice of their lords, more than twelve millions of acres of the best land are under grass or clover and out of cultivation, producing less than one-eighth of what they might produce for the support of man, and that of Ireland's twenty millions of acres scarcely three produce crops for human food?[2]

Excessive labour, and the inadequate and unfair remuneration of labour paid by capitalists, are abuses which the State ought, by wise legislation, to check and repress, for not only do they injure individual rights, but tend to the destruction of the community in general. There are other abuses which, though they may not injure the strict right of any individual, are equally dangerous to society, and should be corrected by prudent legislation. Thus the State, while bound to protect tenants by means of just laws, should, moreover, place a firm check on the over-accumulation of landed property in the hands of those who do not want it for their own use, nor cultivate it themselves. It should, likewise, prevent the over-accumulation of business in the hands of one employer or company, especially when it is carried on with borrowed money. No one ought to engross and absorb the livelihood

[1] See Monsignor E. G. Bagshawe, as before cited, p. 18.

[2] The ills that afflict Ireland and the odious abuses of landlords were most warmly stigmatised by Monsignor Bagshawe in a lecture given in the Town Hall of Birmingham. See Monsignor Bagshawe, *The Monstrous Evils of English Rule in Ireland, especially since the Union*, p. 23. Nottingham: Watchorn, 1886.

of all smaller trades people in his neighbourhood, and to surround himself with innumerable workmen, all wholly depending on his particular good or bad fortune, and on his caprice, especially when their state of dependence is aggravated by the daily probability of his bankruptcy and failure, which would involve them all in his ruin. The State should further check all unlimited competition, which, as we see everywhere, now leads to over-production, to under-selling, to manifold dishonesty, to a selfish strife among employers, to a mutually ruinous war between employers and employed, and so to strikes, to failures, and to the general ruin of trade.[1]

The situation in which labour is now placed by capital is odious and intolerable. Labour cannot be assimilated to a mere commodity, the price of which may vary with every fluctuation of the market. Man is created in the image of God, and sent into this world in order that he may earn his daily bread; he cannot be considered as inferior to a machine, the owner of which is obliged to keep it in good working order, even when it is not producing.

Private right must yield when the common good requires it. If the State has a right to expropriate property with a view to public utility, and may even subordinate contracts to certain given conditions, has it not likewise a right to protect the weak and to defend the interests of the working classes? If we do not secure justice for the workers and offer them valid protection, they will be driven to join the ranks of Democratic Socialism.

The labour the workman supplies to his master is worth far more than the money he receives in return, for he gives all his powers of body and mind in exchange for what is very frequently a sheer mockery of remuneration. Now, if the contract for labour is simply an exchange, it becomes evident that public morality is violated when the workman receives not only less than is due to him, but even less than what is necessary for his sustenance. The so-called liberty of the workman is nothing better than a derision, since, if he would avoid starvation, the workman is obliged to accept the terms

[1] See Monsignor Bagshawe, *Mercy and Justice*, etc., p. 20.

offered to him. The manufacturer keeps his machines and horses in perfect condition, and the State even goes so far as to take measures to secure against the bursting of boilers. How, then, is it that no heed is taken to prevent the deterioration of the human being, and the consequent injury to society in general? Justice and the public interest must necessarily legitimise the intervention of Government, and it is an error to wish to replace the action of the State by that of corporations. If God has imposed certain duties on the State, the mere fact of its having ceased to be Christian does not exonerate it from fulfilling them, if it would ward off the evil which now threatens not one State alone, but all civilised society.[1]

However, there are some English Catholics who, like Mr. Devas, the economist, formerly admitted the necessity of fixing a minimum wage,[2] yet seem to be impressed by the dangers of State Socialism,[3] and have not reached the daring conclusions of Monsignor Bagshawe.

Although the members of the Catholic clergy in England are thus active and intelligent, and, in many cases, sincerely democratic, it must nevertheless be avowed that in no country in the world have they merited so much love and veneration as in Ireland, where for more than a century they have striven

[1] See the address delivered by Monsignor Bagshawe at the second section of the Congress of Liége, 9th September, 1890, in the *Supplément à la Gazette de Liége*, 10th September, 1890; he also defended international labour legislation with much warmth. On Monsignor Bagshawe and his social views, see also De Pascal, "Monseigneur Bagshawe, év. de Nottingham," in the *Association Catholique, revue mensuelle des questions sociales et ouvrières*, vol. xxv., p. 109 and following; Vogelsang, "Sociale Chronik," in the *Oesterreichische Monatsschrift für christlich-sociale Reform*, p. 283, May, 1884. See likewise another pamphlet by Monsignor Bagshawe, *The Danger to Christianity of the School Board System, and the Injustice of the Monopoly of the Rates which the Law gives to Non-Christian Schools*. Nottingham: Clayton. And other beautiful and noble pastoral letters by the intrepid Bishop of Nottingham.

[2] See C. S. Devas, "Le juste salaire," in the *Association Catholique*, vol. xxii., p. 467 and following.

[3] See the impartial article by C. S. Devas, "An Olive Branch on State Socialism," in the *Dublin Review*, pp. 319-335, April, 1888.

with the most wonderful energy in behalf of the unfortunate tenantry against the exactions of the landlords and the miserable Irish policy of the English Government. And while, little by little, the old national tongue has almost ceased to be spoken in the Green Isle, and even the old Celtic race has fallen off under Anglo-Saxon sway, it is only owing to the Catholic Church, which has kept alive their old religious faith, that the Irish have preserved any vestige of their nationality.

No wonder, then, if Monsignor Walsh, Archbishop of Dublin, and all the Catholic clergy of the island, strive so energetically in defence of the poor Irish tenants, and if in the struggle they are the most part of the time, and by the very necessity of things, driven to adopt a programme which is simply that of Agrarian Socialism. [1]

In the United States, Catholicism is daily making far more rapid progress than it does in European countries. While the various Protestant communions are in constant strife with each other, and a prey to discord, the Catholic Church turns their dissensions to advantage, and is ever increasing in strength and numbers. Americans are extremely tenacious in their religious traditions, and even at the present day many of the States of the Federation favour and encourage the development and spread of religious belief.

[1] On the action of the Catholic clergy in Ireland and their views on the Irish question, see Piché, "Pour l'Irlande," in the *Association Catholique*, vol. xxv., p. 77 and following; and in the same review, "L'injustice de la rente agraire en Irlande d'après Monseigneur Walsh," vol. xxvii., p. 105 and following; "Question irlandaise," vol. xxii., p. 56 and following; Ségur-Lemoignon, "Le mouvement social et la question irlandaise," vol. xxi., p. 265 and following. See further the article on the action of the Episcopate on the Irish Question, in the *Civiltà Cattolica*, February, 1890; Nemours Godré, *O'Connell*, Paris, Savine, 1890; De Pascal, *Question irlandaise*, Lyons, Vitte et Perrucel, 1888; the *Catholic Times*, 9th March, 1888; Monsignor Bagshawe, *Mercy and Justice for the Poor*, pp. 13-21, and *The Monstrous Evils of English Rule in Ireland;* Monsignor Walsh, "Arbitration of the Battering-Ram," in the *Contemporary Review*, June, 1889, pp. 797-815; G. Wyndham, "A Short Reply to Archbishop Walsh," in the same review, October, 1889, pp. 600-699; etc.

Since 1850, when the war of opposition to their development ceased, the Catholics have not infrequently proved themselves to be the victorious rivals of the numerous Protestant denominations. The immigration *en masse* of Irish families, most faithfully attached to the Catholic Church, has contributed in no small measure to strengthen and diffuse Catholicism. And while the Protestant communions are daily breaking up into a number of rival Churches of every grade of thought from Rationalism to Illuminism, Catholicism stands unshaken in its iron compactness.[1]

But in a country where the masses participate in all political struggles, where Socialism has penetrated deeply among the people, the Catholic Church has understood the inevitable necessity of interesting itself in the social question, and of taking up and supporting a great portion of the claims of labour.

Although the elements of material prosperity exist in great abundance in America, there is, nevertheless, no country in the world where poverty meets with such scorn as in the United States. In our old European States, imbued with Christian ideas, the fruit of long centuries of atavism, we can form no conception of the degree of humiliation and demoralisation that poverty implies to Americans. What serves as a curb to the masses, and can yet render them docile, is the extreme instability of social relations and conditions, and, finally, the facility with which rapid economic changes come about. But once the immense sources of natural wealth become exhausted, and the accumulation of large fortunes is no longer so easy a matter, the labour question will not fail to make itself felt in the United States with even keener intensity than it is now experienced in European countries.

Moreover, even now the fever for equality has seized upon the workers of the United States, universal suffrage has con-

[1] On the rapid progress and growing power of Catholicism in the United States, see Claude Jannet, *Les Etat-Unis contemporains*, vol. ii., chaps. xvii. and xviii., Paris, E. Plon, third edition, 1877: Duc de Noailles, *Cent ans de république aux Etats Unis*, vol. ii., chap. xxx., Paris, C. Levy, 1889.

tributed to urge them rapidly forward in this direction, and German immigration has introduced numerous germs of revolutionary Socialism. But, generally speaking, American Socialism has not a revolutionary character, and the claims advanced by the *Knights of Labour* and the *Labour Party* bear essential affinities to those of State Socialists. And it is principally in the Labour Party and the Knights of Labour that American Socialism finds its fullest expression, and has formed centres of active propaganda.[1]

Now, far from opposing the Knights of Labour and their claims, the Catholic clergy have very frequently taken their part. And when the Pope, misled by false representations, was about to pass excommunication on the whole society, Cardinal Gibbons, the most eminent among the American bishops, rose to protest against so ill-advised a measure, and succeeded in obtaining the revocation of the sentence.

In order fully to understand the importance of the memorial presented by Cardinal Gibbons in defence of the Knights of Labour, and the weighty significance of the withdrawal of the papal excommunication, it is necessary to know the origin, history, and tendencies of the vast association of the Knights of Labour, an association which counted several hundred thousand adherents, and spread throughout the territory of the United States, exercising an incontestable influence on the American social movement.

In 1869, Uriah S. Stephens, a tailor of Philadelphia, founded, with very slender capital, a working-men's association, the aim of which was, through education, co-operation,

[1] On American Socialism and its tendencies, etc., see A. Sartorius Von Waltherhausen, *Der moderne Sozialismus in der Vereinigten Staaten von America*, p. 422, Berlin, Bahr, 1890; and the interesting study by the American Socialist, L. Gronlund, "Le socialisme aux Etats-Unis," in the *Revue d'economie politique*, year i., pp. 109-124. Waltherhausen shows at length how the idea of American Socialism being an entirely imported factor is quite false. See also the clever work by S. Cognetti de Martiis, *Il socialismo negli Stati Uniti d'America*, Turin, 1891; Ed. and El. Marx Aveling, *The Working-Class Movement in America*, p. 189, London, Swan Sonnenschein; and R. T. Ely, *The Labour Movement in America*, London, Heinemann, 1891.

and the diligent exercise of the suffrage, gradually to abolish the present system of wages. In founding this association, to which he gave the name of *Noble and Holy Order of the Knights of Labour*, Stephens, who was a remarkably energetic man, believed that the depression in wages was entirely due to the abuses of labour, and that only a secret society could put an end to the evil. The men who, on 28th October, 1869, agreed to adopt the views put forth by Stephens, were but six in number. The order was enveloped in secrecy and mystery; the motto adopted and inscribed on the seal of the order was "taken from the precepts of Solon, the Grecian sage and law-giver: 'That is the most perfect government in which an injury to one is the concern of all'". Each new member received on admission the following instructions: Labour is noble and holy; to defend it from degradation, to divest it of the evils to body, mind, and estate which ignorance and the greed of man has fastened upon it, and to rescue the toiler from the grasp of the selfish, is a work worthy of the noblest and best of our race. Capital has its combinations in all the diversified branches of trade, and, wittingly or not, frequently crushes the manly hopes of the worker and ruins poor humanity. We do not intend to create antagonism against necessary capital, no conflict with legitimate enterprise is contemplated; but in their haste and greed men are blinded by self-interest, overlook the interests of others, and frequently violate the rights of such as they deem helpless and defenceless. We mean to uphold the dignity of labour and to affirm the nobility of all who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow. We intend to work for the creation of a healthy public opinion on the subject of labour—the only creator of values—and to advocate the justice of its receiving a full, complete share of the values or capital it creates. We shall lend all our strength to support all laws made to harmonise labour and capital, or that tend to lighten the exhaustiveness of toil. To attend to his work, to look to his interests, to acquire knowledge of the world of trade, to unite, organise, and co-operate with the great army of peace and industry, to foster and tend, to raise and develop the temple in which he dwells, such is the

highest and noblest duty of man towards his fellow-men and towards his Creator.[1] On the 6th January, 1870, were elected the principal officers of the association. The names given to them were more or less extraordinary: James L. Wright was the Venerable Sage; U. S. Stephens, the Master Workman; R. W. Keen, Worthy Foreman; W. Cook, Worthy Inspector; J. Kennedy, the Unknown Knight; etc.[2] In the beginning, all the decisions of the order were guarded with the strictest secrecy; to this end the following classes were excluded from membership: doctors, as being liable, through their professional confidences, to divulge the secrets of the society to hostile ears;[3] politicians, because of the low opinion held of their moral worth; lawyers, as having no reason to exist in a good social organisation, and because they earn their livelihood by exertions that can hardly be classed among the honest efforts of labour; finally, all persons engaged in the sale of intoxicating drink.

But in the meantime the obligation to secrecy formed an obstacle to the diffusion of the Knights of Labour. In 1872, on Stephens' resigning the office of Master Workman, he was replaced by Robert C. Macauley. It was also about that period that the first local assemblies were properly organised, and that the association received the strongest impulse. At Philadelphia, in 1877, was held the first general assembly, by which Stephens was proclaimed Grand Master Workman. It was attended by representatives from each of the local assemblies—these were composed of tailors, miners, shoemakers, machinists, mechanics, millers, glass-workers, printers, coopers, carpenters, and teachers. In the meantime the order had been organised on a basis similar to that of the American Government—the local assemblies represented the townships, the district assemblies the single States, the

[1] See the interesting article by Carrol D. Wright in the *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Boston, January, 1887; it gives a minute account of the history and origin of the Knights of Labour. See also the *Revue d'économie politique*, year i., pp. 109 and following, and 410 and following.

[2] Wright, see article already quoted.

[3] The regulation interdicting the admission of doctors was abolished in 1881. See C. D. Wright, as above.

general assembly the Federal Government. The members numbered but a few thousands when, in 1877 and 1878, several local and district assemblies separated from the general assembly; this was principally on the ground of religious disagreement. The Catholics ill tolerated the ritual, which was modelled on Protestant ceremonies. Then it was that, in June, 1878, the general assembly, with a view to warding off threatening dangers, decided to make public the aims of the order, and to remove all causes of dissension with the Catholic members.

In 1879 Stephens was replaced by Terence W. Powderly, a man of wonderful energy, who had already taken a most active part in propagating the *Greenback Labour Party*. In 1881 the general assembly rendered public the name and purpose of the society; the constitution was then revised, and women were admitted on an equal footing with men. The press now began to take notice of the progress made by the Knights of Labour, exaggerating their accounts, and thus contributing to the wider diffusion of the order. From 1885 it increased so rapidly that the executive board was obliged to suspend the further admission of members. In April, 1886, before the Curtin Committee, which was appointed by Congress to investigate the south-west strike, Mr. Powderly said: "We have not more than five hundred thousand members, though we are said to have fifty millions".

"The recent alarming development and aggression of aggregated wealth"—thus runs the declaration of the principles of the order—"which will inevitably lead to the pauperisation and degradation of the toiling masses, render it imperative, if we desire to enjoy the blessings of life, that a check should be placed upon its power and upon unjust accumulation, and a system adopted which will secure to the labourer the fruit of his toil.

"This much-desired object can only be accomplished through the united efforts of those who obey the divine injunction: 'In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat thy bread'."

In consequence, "we have formed the order of the

Knights of Labour, with a view to securing the organisation and direction, by co-operative effort, of the power of the industrial classes," not in the interest of any political party—the order is more and higher than all parties, and represents sentiments and measures for the benefit of the whole people. Members must bear in mind that the greater part of the results we hope for can only be obtained through legislation, and that it is the duty of every one to vote only for such candidates as will pledge their support of those measures, regardless of party. "*No member shall, however, be compelled to vote with the majority.*" We submit to the world the objects sought to be accomplished by our organisation, calling upon all who believe in securing "the greatest good to the greatest number" to aid and assist us:—

"I. To bring within the folds of organisation every department of productive industry, making knowledge a standpoint for action, and industrial and moral worth, not wealth, the true standard of individual and national greatness.

"II. To secure to the toilers a proper share of the wealth they create; more of the leisure that rightfully belongs to them; more social advantages; more of the benefits, privileges, and emoluments of the world; in a word, all those rights and privileges necessary to make them capable of enjoying, appreciating, defending, and perpetuating the blessings of good government.

"III. To arrive at the true condition of the producing masses in their educational, moral, and financial condition by demanding from the various Governments the establishment of bureaus of labour-statistics.

"IV. The establishment of co-operative institutions, productive and distributive.

"V. The reserving of the public lands—the heritage of the people—for the actual settler, not another acre for railroads or speculators; and that all lands now held for speculative purposes be taxed to their full value.

"VI. The abrogation of all laws that do not bear equally upon capital and labour, the removal of unjust technicalities, delays and discriminations in the administration of justice,

and the adoption of measures providing for the health and safety of those engaged in mining, manufacturing, or building pursuits.

"To secure an indemnity to all such as suffer injury from want of the necessary precautions.

"The legal recognition of the trades unions, and of all orders and associations organised by the working classes with a view to improve their condition and defend their rights.

"VII. The enactment of laws to compel chartered corporations to pay their employees weekly, in full, for labour performed during the preceding week, in the lawful money of the country.

"VIII. The enactment of laws giving mechanics and labourers a first lien on their work for their full wages.

"IX. The abolition of the contract system in national, State, and municipal work.

"X. The substitution of arbitration for strikes, whenever and wherever employers and employees are willing to meet on equitable grounds.

"XI. The prohibition of the employment of children in workshops, mines, and factories before attaining their fourteenth year.

"XII. To abolish the system of letting out by contract the labour of convicts in our prisons and reformatory institutions.

"XIII. To secure for both sexes equal pay for equal work.

"XIV. The reduction of the hours of labour to eight per day, so that the labourers may have more time for social enjoyment and intellectual improvement, and be enabled to reap the advantages conferred by the labour-saving machinery which their brains have created.

"XV. To levy a graduated income tax.

"We demand of Congress:—

"I. The establishment of a national monetary system, in which a circulating medium in necessary quantity shall issue directly to the people, without the intervention of banks; that all the national issue shall be full legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private; and that the Government shall

not guarantee or recognise any private banks, or create any banking corporations.

"II. That Government shall not create bonds at interest or bills of credit, but, when there is need for it, shall issue legal money bearing no interest.

"III. That the importation of foreign labour under contract be prohibited.

"IV. That Government shall organise, by means of the post, financial exchange, sure deposits, and facilities for investing small savings.

"V. That the Government shall obtain by purchase, under the right of eminent domain, all telegraphs, telephones, and railroads; and that hereafter no charter or licence be issued to any corporation for construction or operation of any means of transporting intelligence, passengers, or freight.

"Besides presenting these demands to the State and the national Government, we shall further unite our efforts:—

"I. To establish a co-operative institution, tending to replace, by means of a co-operative system, the present system of wages.

"II. To secure for both sexes equal pay for equal work.

"III. To shorten the hours of labour by a general refusal to work more than eight hours.

"IV. To prevail upon industrialists to accept arbitration in all differences arising between them and their employees, and thereby to strengthen the bond of sympathy between them, and render strikes uncalled for."

According to the constitution, the local assembly tends to assist the members, to improve their moral, social, and financial condition. Although, in the face of oppression, it may sometimes be necessary to have recourse to strikes, yet this means is to be avoided as much as possible. Strikes can secure but a temporary improvement; to obtain the abolition of the actual wage system the members should employ organisation, co-operation, and public activity. Our mission cannot be accomplished in a day, or in one generation. Agitation, education, and organisation are needed. Among the highest duties to be inculcated in the local assemblies, the

most important are the inalienable heritage and right of man to possess a part of the soil; the right to live entails the right to the means of subsistence; all those statutes that form an obstacle to such rights are unjust, and must be done away with.

Although the Knights of Labour purpose to obtain the abolition of the wage system, and the improvement of the condition of the working class by means of pacific propaganda, although they have repeatedly declared that they consider 'pacific movements as the best and surest means of obtaining, the necessary reforms," and have stigmatised the needless violence of Radical Socialism, they intend none the less to work a profound change in the actual economic *régime*, nor are their conclusions and programme less imbued with Socialism on this account.

It was after the great strikes organised in 1885 by the Knights of Labour that the Pope, yielding to prejudiced representations, excommunicated the order.

So long as Stephens was at the head of the Knights of Labour the association had maintained a pacific character. But later on, growing conscious of its strength and power, the society began to promote vast strikes, thus causing agitation and terror among the industrialists.

"The doctrine of an equal right to life and liberty," said one of the declarations of the order, "implies an equal right to the use of the elements necessary to existence; and that system which compels citizens to purchase of other citizens the right to cultivate unoccupied soil, or that allows companies to appropriate to themselves mines, deposits of minerals, oil, gas, etc., constitutes a violation of natural justice."[1]

In a manifesto published in 1882, the Knights of Labour extended still further their claims; they demanded that the public land, heritage of the people, should be reserved to those who cultivate it. As the right to live implies the right to the means of subsistence, it should necessarily include the

[1] See the article by Fontpertuis in the *Économiste français*, 24th July, 1886; also the pamphlet by Ernest Brelay, *Les chevaliers du travail*, Paris, 1892.

right to possess a part of the soil. They further demanded that the State should assume the monopoly of all railroads and mines.[1]

The number of strikes gradually increased; in 1887 there were eight hundred and fifty-seven in the United States, three hundred and sixty-two of which resulted in favour of the workmen. Four-fifths, at least, of these strikes had been promoted and supported by the Knights of Labour.[2]

Nor did they limit their action to strikes; they had also recourse to that most dangerous arm, boycotting. From the day in which the association pronounced sentence of boycott against any industrialist, no member of the immense family of the Knights of Labour might work for him, no one might purchase any goods from him. In this manner, the boycott system was extended, not only to individuals, but also to companies and commercial firms.

Notwithstanding the abuses of the Knights of Labour and their exorbitant demands, the papal excommunication produced a painful impression among the American bishops, who, for the most part, shared the views of the Knights, with whom they not infrequently made common cause. Of the seventy-five Catholic bishops in the United States, seventy were of opinion that the excommunication was contrary to the interests of the Church. Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, the most eminent among the American prelates, came in person to Rome, and presented to the Pope a Memorial, in which he defended with great energy the Socialistic principles of the Knights of Labour. He succeeded, though not without some difficulty, in persuading the Pope to revoke the excommunication.[3]

[1] See Villard, *Le socialisme moderne, Son dernier état*, p. 209. Paris: Guillaumin, 1889.

[2] See Villard, as above, p. 210.

[3] See in the *Association Catholique, revue mensuelle des questions sociales et ouvrières*, vol. xxiii., p. 488 and following, the "Mémoire de S. E. le Cardinal Gibbons sur les chevaliers du travail". See also in the same review, L. Laga, "Les chevaliers du travail," vol. xxii., p. 703 and following; "Les chevaliers du travail et le Saint Siège," vol. xxvi., p. 729 and following.

According to Cardinal Gibbons, the Knights of Labour are not only worthy of the highest consideration, but their statutes contain nothing contrary to the principles of the Church or of morality. The monopolies exercised both by individuals and corporations daily call forth the complaints of the working classes, and are a danger to liberty. The heartless avarice of capitalists, who seek by every means to increase their gain and to control legislation to their own profit, pitilessly grinds down not only the men, but even women and children, in various employments. The labouring classes have consequently the right to resist such iniquity, and to organise so as to oppose a remedy to the dangers with which both civilisation and social order are menaced by avarice, oppression, and corruption. These evils exist in all countries, and are no less serious in America than elsewhere.[1] Considering this, the condemnation of the Knights of Labour for struggling with all their might against the abuses of capitalism, does not seem justified or prudent, especially if we reflect that "the reality of the sufferings of the working classes, and the fact of the existence of these evils, are universally acknowledged by the American people". Moreover, the condemnation would be dangerous for the reputation of the Church in our democratic country, and might even lead to persecution, and cause division among American Catholics, the majority of whom would take the part of the condemned association. Finally, the Papal condemnation would be justly regarded as a cruel blow to the authority of the bishops of the United States, who, it is well known, share the principles declared and maintained by the Knights of Labour, and are unanimous in protesting against such a condemnation.[2]

And from London, the late Cardinal Manning raised also his eloquent voice in defence of the Knights of Labour. "Up to the present," wrote the eminent Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, "the world has been governed by dynasties; henceforward the Holy See must treat with the people, and with bishops who are in close daily and personal relations with the

[1] Cardinal Gibbons, *Mémoire sur les chevaliers du travail.*
[2] *Ibid*

people. The more this is clearly and fully acknowledged, the more firmly will the exercise of spiritual authority be established. Never in past times was the hierarchy so free of hindrance from the civil power, so mutually responsible, so united with the Holy See as at present. To recognise this evident fact, and turn it to account, means power; to neglect it, or not to perceive it, would lead to endless confusion. This is the opportunity of the present. The Church is the Mother, Friend, and Protectress of the people. As our Divine Saviour lived among persons of the people, so lives His Church. On this point the cardinal's argument is irresistible. I trust that before leaving Rome he may clearly discover to all this New World, the World of the Future."[1]

"For," as wrote Cardinal Gibbons, in defence of the Knights of Labour, in the memorial he presented to Cardinal Simeoni, "since it is acknowledged by all that the great questions of the future are not those of war, of commerce, or of finance, but the social questions, the questions which concern the improvement of the condition of the great popular masses, and especially of the working people, it is evidently of supreme importance that the Church should be always found on the side of humanity, of justice towards the multitudes who compose the body of the human family. As Cardinal Manning has so well written, 'I know I am treading on a very difficult subject, but I feel confident of this, that we must face it, and that we must face it calmly, justly, and with a willingness to put labour and the profits of labour second—the moral state and domestic life of the whole working population first. I will not venture to draw up such an act of Parliament further than to lay down this principle . . . these things (the present condition of the poor in England) cannot go on. . . . No commonwealth can rest on such foundations. In our country above all, this social amelioration is the inevitable programme of the future; and the position which the Church should hold towards it is obvious.'"

Yielding to the instances of Cardinal Gibbons and the

[1] See letter by Cardinal Manning, "Les chevaliers du travail," in the *Association Catholique*, vol. xxiii., p. 505 and following.

American bishops, the Pope recalled the sentence of excommunication, and the Knights of Labour were thus free to carry on their propaganda among the Catholics, without meeting any opposition from the Catholic clergy.[1]

Another fact that is not wanting in significance is, that in spite of the pressure brought to bear upon the Holy See from various quarters, Henry George's book has not been put in the *Index*, for in the views advanced by the agrarian collectivist of the United States the Church found nothing contrary to her own teachings or the principles of the Gospel.

In the Papal Encyclical Letter on the labour question there are, of a truth, a few words that seem to allude to the theories of Henry George, condemning them. According to the Sovereign Pontiff, human necessities constantly repeat themselves; satisfied to-day, they return to-morrow. Nature has, in consequence, placed at the disposal of man a lasting and permanent element capable of providing him with the means of subsistence. This element can be no other than the soil, with its inexhaustible fertility. "*Habent*," says Leo XIII., "*cuiusque hominis necessitates velut perpetuos reditus, ita ut hodie expletæ, in crastinum nove imperent. Igitur rem quamdam debet homini natura dedisse stabilem perpetuamque mansuram, unde perennitas subsidii expectari posset. Atqui hujus modi perennitatem nulla res præstare, nisi cum ubertatibus suis terra, potest.*"

Mr. George replied at length in a book which has since gone the round of the world, and is a complete summing up of the views and reasons of the brilliant American writer.

If, without actually meeting with opposition from the Catholics, the anti-property or Labour party incurred pretty frequently, however, their blame, it was by no means on account of its economic views, but owing to the ill-advised attitude of its leader, the Rev. Dr. MacGlynn. Moreover, Dr. MacGlynn's violent demeanour estranged from him not

[1] See the interesting and widely read book by R. Josiah Strong, *Our Country, its possible future and its present crises;* New York, 1887. Mr. Strong writes at length of the associations and popular agitations in the United States.

only the Catholics, but all Socialists of good sense, and also Mr. Henry George, for in his violent attacks and accusations he did not spare even the illustrious author of *Progress and Poverty*.[1] But so long as the object of the Labour party had been war to capitalism and the abolition of the wage system, the Catholics had not refused to rally round Dr. MacGlynn, and to follow him in his crusade against individual possession of the soil, and the abuses of capital and industrialism.[2]

I have often noted the fact that even the most advanced Catholic Socialists have, nevertheless, very restricted views in the matter of politics. This it is that renders possible the strange contrast of men who, while on the one hand they go the length of supporting the boldest social reforms, yet on the other oppose the most moderate reforms in politics.

It is only in countries where, as in Switzerland, England, and the United States, democracy has firmly and profoundly taken root and is based on solid traditions, that Catholic Socialists are frequently sincere democrats as well.

And, especially in America, we have heard and daily hear eminent archbishops and prelates of high intellectual worth openly declare themselves the enemies of all privilege, be it economic or social, intolerant of every form of aristocracy that is based on mere birth or fortune, and desirous not only of a government that is democratic *in favour of* the people, but democratic *through* the people.

In our old Europe that still bends its weary back meekly and with docility under the yoke of the cruel hydra of privilege, no bishop would venture to say what in America Monsignor Ireland, the ardent Archbishop of St. Paul, daily repeats,

[1] See the *Association Catholique, revue mensuelle des questions sociales et ouvrières*, "Le Labour Party," vol. xxv., p. 585 and following.

[2] See in the *North American Review*, July, 1887, the interesting article by Henry George, "The New Party," which gives a very clear account of the causes of the rapid success of that party. Mr. George says that the cause advocated by the New party (later Labour party) is so just, so evidently destined to meet with success, that the Catholics did not hesitate to join it and place themselves under the orders of Dr. MacGlynn.

and what is constantly said by other eminent members of the American hierarchy.

"Have no fear of the new," said Monsignor Ireland, in the course of a memorable address. "Well-based principles are always able to defend themselves. But this is an age of novelties, and, in order to keep pace with the age, religious action must adopt new forms and new methods. Let each one have his own field of action. There is no necessity that the layman should wait to follow the lead of the priest, nor the priest that of his bishop, nor the bishop that of the Pope; let each follow his own path. We are bound to live with the age, to know it, and to keep ourselves in touch with it. . . . The world has entered upon an entirely new phase. The past can return no more. Re-action is as the dream of men who neither see nor comprehend, of men who, seated at the portals of a necropolis, weep over tombs that can never be re-opened, and forget the living world around them. Let us, therefore, speak to our age of things that it feels, and in language that it understands. . . . In all countries, but above all in America, the strength of the Church lies in the people. The days of princes and feudal suzerains are gone. As to kings, why, they only occupy their thrones on the condition of doing the will of the people. Woe to the religion that does not understand this fact! Who has won the masses reigns, and the masses are only to be won through their intelligence and their heart. No power can control them that does not appeal to their free souls. A terrible lesson is taught to us by some States of old Europe, where, from the sheer weight of traditions, the Church still clings to certain thrones and certain castes, and is thus, at the present day, losing her power over the people."[1]

And a little later on Monsignor Ireland affirmed the same thing with even greater emphasis:—

"The time is come in which a new order must replace the

[1] This address was delivered on the 10th November, 1889, at the celebration of the Centenary of the Institution of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of the United States, and in the presence of Cardinal Gibbons and seventy-three bishops and archbishops. See *Le xx^me^ Siècle*, September, 1890.

old. Formerly the Church had to deal with courts and dynasties. But in a republic courts and dynasties do not exist. Moreover, in all nations of the civilised world that have not yet adopted the republican form of government, kings and princes are now-a-days but the representatives and servants of the people. That which was once called *Divine Right*, the absolutism of past ages, has passed out of the conception and aims of all Christian peoples. The Church must, in consequence, turn back directly towards the people. And although the people may yet accept sovereigns who are willing to reign as their representatives in the temporal order, they will never designate them as their representatives or organs in the religious order. . . . As to that portion of a nation that is distinguished by the insignia of nobility or fortune, we must consider it, not as the people, but only as a small fraction of the people. It has no right to subordinate the masses to its interests, as if the people had no other reason to be. *Nobility is nothing. Fortune has nothing that claims respect*, unless their aims and object be the greatest good of the greatest number. Do not enslave the masses. Allow them independence, to win their right to life, to freedom, to happiness, within the bounds of justice and morality ; it is the mission of the Church to define these bounds, such as they were traced out by the Divine Master of all Christians."[1]

Unless we go back to far distant times, it is rare, alas ! to hear from a high dignitary of any Church, from the lips of an archbishop, words so noble, so ardent with faith and enthusiasm.

Citizen of a mighty and free State, representative of an essentially democratic religion, Monsignor Ireland was one of the first ecclesiastics who had the courage to proclaim thus warmly the social future of democracy.[2]

[1] See the article published in Monsignor Ireland's review, the *North-Western Chronicle*, April, 1891.

[2] Monsignor Ireland had the courage to express his views with ardour, not only in the hearing of his own democratic diocesans and fellow-countrymen, but also at Paris, before Conservative Catholic assemblies. See *La Revue Générale*, p. 120 and following; July, 1892.

In this rapid review of Catholic Socialism, we have frequently noted the fact that Socialism has spread in its most intense and violent form in those countries where the masses have but lately, and in the face of the greatest obstacles, been able to win their political liberty and participation in electoral rights. Spain furnishes one of the most striking proofs of this fact, for in few other countries has revolutionary Socialism left such sanguinary and tragic memories. The Cantonalist Insurrection in 1873, which was suffocated in blood; the agrarian troubles in Andalusia, where the possession of the land is confined to a very few hands; the violent acts of *La Mano negra* (secret society of "The Black Hand"); the recent crimes at Barcelona, have all contributed to attach a most odious character to Spanish Socialism. Since the congress at the Hague, the Spanish Socialists have abandoned the collectivism of Marx, and embraced the criminal theories of Bakunin, and since that time they have declared war to the death against the family, religion and property.[1] And the popular orators still continue to advocate anarchy and destruction of the most brutal and odious form. The Socialist journals and the few writers who contribute to them are wanting in any species of economic culture, and contain, for the most part, but rambling diatribes against God and property.

This excessive intemperance and violence are not, however,

[1] Concerning the Anarchist agitations in Spain see E. de Laveleye, *Le socialisme contemporain*, pp. 229-278, fifth edition, Paris, 1890. The violent language used by the Spanish Anarchists and Socialists is something quite incredible. One Anarchist journal, *Los Decamisados*, thus speaks of religion: "Let us free ourselves at last from that puppet called God, that is only good for frightening children. Religions are but trades destined to fatten those mountebanks of priests, as Dupuis calls them, at the expense of the people. That is our programme. However, before putting it into execution, there will be need of a good blood-letting, brief but copious. The rotten boughs must be lopped off in order that the social tree may develop. Tremble, ye bourgeois, who have fattened on our toil! Make room for the shirtless, the *decamisados*. Your tyranny is about to end. Our black flag is unfurled, and will lead us to victory." See De Laveleye, as above.

a privilege reserved to the Anarchists solely, but are common in Spain to all social classes, and, more or less, to all parties, and must be attributed to the character and education of the Spanish people. Spanish Catholics, allowing naturally for a few exceptions, are no less intemperate and violent, from their point of view, than are the Anarchists. The last Catholic Congress held at Saragossa is the strongest proof that the evil which afflicts Spain, and is consequently rendering the country a prey to agitations, is not an evil confined to any one class or group of persons, but is a far more deadly evil, that troubles the entire organisation of the nation.

It will therefore be easy to understand how it is that the Spanish Catholics have preferred, and still prefer, organising Carlist risings and discussing the temporal power of the Pope to giving their support to the social question.

Nevertheless, some attempts have been made, and not a few Catholics in Spain accept a great part of the doctrines of Socialism. The Archbishop of Madrid, in one of his pastoral letters, sought to study a solution of the social question. The Catholics of the dioceses of Tolosa and Valencia have founded about thirty clubs or societies of agricultural labourers. These clubs count about twelve thousand members, have savings banks and pawn offices of their own, and extend their sphere of action among the poor peasants and the destitute classes. [1]

The guild movement has likewise found several supporters; Don Juan M. Orti has written a Spanish translation of Abbé Hitze's book, *Die sociale Frage*,[2] and Count di Torreanar has raised his voice in defence of the old guild system, the advantages of which he upheld in a speech delivered at the Academy of Moral and Political Science.[3] On the breaking out of

[1] See the *Regolamento-tipo para los Circulos de Obreros católicos de la diócesis de Tortosa*, p. 40. Tortosa: F. Biarnes, 1888.

[2] Hitze, *El Problema Social y sa Solucion, obra precedida de un estudio sobre el mismo asunto par D. J. M. Orti y Lara*, p. 473. Madrid: Libreria de San José.

[3] See also R. Rodriguez de Cepeda, *Elementos de Derecho natural*, lessons 33, 53, 54, and 55. Valencia: Domenech, 1888.

certain strikes, Don José Morgades y Gili, Bishop of Vich, interested himself in the labour question, recognising the greater part of the claims advanced by the workmen. But the remedies by which he sought to oppose real material evils were of a purely spiritual nature, that in other times might have sufficed to restore peace, but which fail now-a-days to satisfy any one, and are by no means potent enough to calm the masses.[1]

The accounts given of the congress at Saragossa are of admirable eloquence. While hundreds of orators made vain protests against the invasion of revolutionary principles, and, hurling insolence at the Italian Government, expressed wishes for the restoration of the temporal power, very few attended to the social question, or treated it with large views and in a manner worthy of the subject.[2]

State Socialism has met with but few supporters in Spain. Passions and enmities are too intense throughout the Iberian Peninsula to allow much chance of success to Catholic Socialism, which is in substance but the application of Christian principles to State Socialism.

Also in Italy, where the economic inequalities are no less profound, and the conflict no less intense, the clergy have kept aloof from socialistic agitation, and have given little or no thought to the social question.

In other European countries, as Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, and Austria, the Catholic party may even oppose the Government, and aim at securing political power, without failing in patriotic sentiment. No Ultramontane priest so much as dreams that the triumph of the Clerical party in Belgium means the dissolution of the Fatherland, and Catholics and Liberals may possibly come to an understanding on certain general lines.

[1] See the *Exhortacion pastoral que el Excmo. é Ilmo. Dr. D. José Morgades y Gili, Obispo de Vich, dirige al Clero y fideles de su diócesis sobre la devocion al sagrado corazón de Jesús y la cuestion obrera*, Vich, 13th June, 1890.

[2] See accounts of the Congress in *El Pilar*, 4th and 14th October of the year in which it was held.

But in Italy the position of things is essentially different. The territorial aspirations of the Papacy, the strife between Church and State, render it impossible that any political agitation in favour of the Church can be otherwise than anti-patriotic and anti-national. If the political principles maintained by the Papacy, and defended by it with extraordinary tenacity, were to triumph, the unity of the nation would be for ever destroyed. Consequently, although Italian Catholics recognise the Pope as their spiritual head, they are not favourable to the claims and territorial aspirations of the Church.

There is, moreover, another cause no less serious, which nevertheless withholds the clergy from taking any very active part in the social movement of the country—the extreme vicinity of the Papacy.

In all those countries in which the Catholics have been obliged to defend their faith and principles against the expansion of Protestantism, the struggle has strengthened the power of the Church and has accustomed the clergy to the practical discussion of social problems. The German priest, who is daily obliged to preserve the fidelity of the Catholic masses, lest they should be won over to Protestantism, is bound to look to the needs of the people, and to constitute himself very frequently as the defender of popular rights.

Whereas in Italy the absence of religious conflict has divested the clergy of all warlike spirit, and is leading them more and more to attend to purely ecclesiastical questions and to consider politics as absolutely foreign to their mission and duties.

The immediate vicinity of the Papacy has also rendered impossible any great individual initiative among the members of the clergy. No Italian cardinal would ever have taken, or perhaps ever will take, upon himself the defence of the suffering poor, promoting agitations in their behalf, as did Cardinal Gibbons and the late Cardinal Manning. No prelate will probably ever recognise the justice of popular claims, and the greater part of the demands of Socialism, with the same enthusiasm as did Monsignor Ketteler. The Catholics are, as it were, intimidated by the vicinity of the Vatican, and have

never attempted anything beyond mere vague agitations. There is not one of them who would venture to point out the evils that torment modern society, or acknowledge the justice of democratic aspirations with sincerity equal to that shown by M. Decurtins and the late Baron Von Vogelsang.

While the upper clergy of the cities are indifferent and inert, and intent mainly on rapid promotion, those of the country places are, for the most part, wanting in culture, weak, uncertain, ill-directed, living the life of the peasants, guided by the same passions as the provincial bourgeoisie, and can in consequence have but narrow ideas and a limited programme. When Carpi attempted to make an inquiry into the condition of the bourgeois classes, the results showed the Italian clergy as they really are, weak and ignorant.

The figures of Cardinal Manning and Monsignor Bagshawe in England, of De Mun in France, of Decurtins in Switzerland, of Abbé Hitze in Germany, and of Von Vogelsang in Austria, will ever stand apart as State Socialists who, while looking to the Church for moral reform, expected and wished all economic reforms to come from the State alone.

The Italian Catholics, obliged as they are by the Vatican to hold themselves apart from the political movement, or at least to take credit for doing so, must necessarily not only not desire, but even fear, the intervention of the State in the economic struggle.

It was only in 1885 that the late Father C. M. Curci published a book in which he accepted the general lines of the Socialist programme, and with a view to founding a Christian Socialist movement in Italy. The work in question made a great deal of noise, but was not widely read ; it was ponderous in style and contained many and useless digressions on the duel, suicide, begging, on the possibility of putting an end to warfare, and even on the protection of animals.[1] According to Father Curci, the workman of to-day has acquired the moral command of his own person, " but in so far as regards

[1] See C. M. Curci, *Di un socialismo cristiano nella questione operaia e nel concerto selvaggio dei moderni stati civili*, pp. xxxii., 416. Firenze, 1885.

his share in the commodities he produces he is still kept to a slavish minimum. The sole difference that occurs is that to the slave it was given as the sustenance indispensable to fit him for work; to our modern workman, a free citizen, it is given as a freely contracted wage, and in the moral, civil, and juridical order this is a great deal. But Christian Socialism teaches us in how many points, in the material order, this condition is worse than slavery, which apart from gratuitous cruelties, had at least this merit, that the master's interests were co-involved in the life and vigour of his slave. Nor must we imagine that this difference for the worse is a slight one, or that but few unfortunates are victims to it."[1] This modern form of *civilised* slavery, which economists love to defend, is, in reality, according to Father Curci, no less unjust than was ancient slavery. It was horrible that in former times a man should be bought; it is not well that at the present day labour should be bought regardless of any duty towards the workman, who is remunerated with a wage that is frequently below the minimum necessary for subsistence. The pivot around which turns all Father Curci's arguments is the principle, not admitted in economics, that in the distribution of the wealth produced, capital cannot reasonably demand more than a small interest. Moreover, when capital has received compensation for *cessation of gain*, and is as much as possible safeguarded against all *loss emergent* from the risks of venture, it has not, according to Father Curci, any right to the produce of an industry conducted by others, for which it is used. Father Curci, while accepting a great part of the theories of Lassalle and Marx, advances an entire system of Christian Socialism which, as Bodio has clearly shown, is by no means in harmony with the principles and tendencies of economics, yet is, nevertheless, not wanting in daring or originality.[2]

Some time after the advent of Father Curci's book, there was an awaking of economico-social studies, due to the publi-

[1] See Father Curci's answer to the elegant letter of Comm. Bodio on the book, *Socialismo cristiano*, p. 2. Florence: Bencini, 1885.

[2] See the letter, *Sopra il "Socialismo cristiano,"* etc., as cited above, pp. 13-16.

cations of Father Liberatore and Signor Burri, a young Roman barrister. It was not till later that appeared the pastoral letters of the Archbishop of Capua and of Monsignor Bonomelli.

According to Father Liberatore, "to the workman labour signifies that which is necessary for his sustenance and that of his family. Consequently, if he consecrates his labour to a master, the latter is bound to remunerate him with an equivalent to this labour in order that equality in exchange, or justice, be thus observed—*Justitia æqualitatem importat.* We may, therefore, affirm that the natural price of labour is that which allows the workman to suffice for his own maintenance and that of his wife and of two or three children."[1] This theory is not very practical, and is also, economically speaking, rather inexact!

Nor are Signor Burri's views much more accurate, as expounded in his treatise on *Labour*, which contains much more metaphor than economics. After having admitted a number of premises which should naturally lead him to the legal determination of a minimum wage, he ends by eluding the logical consequences of his thesis.[2]

Monsignor Bonomelli, Bishop of Cremona, is one of the most highly cultured and most impartial among the Italian prelates. His mind is open to all generous impulses; a few years ago he advocated the cause of a conciliation between the Church and the Italian State, declaring frankly that the attitude assumed by the Vatican towards Italy was in no small measure hurtful to Catholic interests. But his generous attempt met with obstacles on all sides, and the learned Bishop of Cremona *laudabiliter se subjecit.*

In his first pastoral letter on social subjects, *Property and Socialism*, Monsignor Bonomelli still confined himself to the obsolete questions of *mine* and *thine.*[3] But in his last, *Capital and Labour*, he resolutely faces the study of the social question. However, he still persists in believing that "the

[1] See Father Liberatore, *Principi di economia politica*, pp. 230-231.

[2] Antonio Burri, *Il lavoro, studio sociale.* Rome: Civelli, 1888.

[3] Monsignor G. Bonomelli, *Un po' più di luce sopra sette verità capitali* Reggio, 1888; *Proprietà e socialismo*, pp. 141-229.

social and labour question is above all a moral and religious question,"[1] and consequently the greater part of his observations and appreciations are based on this preconception. And yet, almost thirty years before, Baron Von Ketteler, from the pulpit of his Cathedral of Mayence, had declared to the Catholic world: "The social question is a stomach question!"

Cardinal Capecelatro, Archbishop of Capua, has likewise confined himself to rather vague assertions. He holds, as a fundamental principle of Christian Socialism, that "although inequalities of fortune cannot be entirely annihilated, for they correspond to certain inequalities inherent in man, yet it is possible, and just, and holy, that little by little, through religion, morality, and sacred science, they may be diminished to such a point, that advancing cautiously step by step, through the action of Christianity and the science which is derived from it, these distances between capitalists and workmen, proprietors and agricultural labourers, may be lessened, and that thus progressing we may reach a point no intellect can as yet foresee".[2] After all this, Cardinal Capecelatro maintains, though in a vague and uncertain manner, the obligation of the Sunday rest, of social legislation in favour of the working class, and also the legal determination of the working day. With regard to the intervention of the State in economic matters, he approves of it in those countries in which the Government is Catholic, but, on the other hand, is opposed to it in non-Catholic States. This distinction is, to say the least, not over felicitous. Gaspard Decurtins, one of the most brilliant among the Catholic Socialists, declared, at the Congress of Aarau, that "hunger is neither Catholic nor Protestant". So it can matter but little whether the Government be Catholic, Protestant, or Atheist; certain economic reforms may be accepted or opposed independently of religion. We have so many Atheists in Europe who are Socialists, and so many Catholics who, in their works on economy, seem to have no

[1] Monsignor G. Bonomelli, *Capitale e lavoro*, p. 43. Cremona: Marini, 1891.

[2] See the Catholic review, *La Campania sacra*, of Capua, p. 361; November, 1890.

preoccupation beyond that of defending the interests of capital. Then, *vice versâ*, again we have Socialists who are at the same time zealous Catholics, and ultra-Conservative Atheists who are the inveterate adversaries of any concession to the labouring classes.

In so far as I know, no other Italian bishop has interested himself in the social question.

I must not, however, pass over unobserved the eminently useful and laudable work carried on by Monsignor Scalabrini, Bishop of Piacenza, a man of wide and democratic views. For several years past he has devoted himself with much zeal and ability to the solution of the problem of emigration, and has founded at Piacenza an Italian emigration society under his own immediate direction. [1]

Nor must I omit to mention Senator Rossi, one of the first industrialists in Italy. In connection with his wool manufactory at Schio, which furnishes employment to little under eight thousand work people, he has opened an infant school fitted to accommodate five hundred children. Moreover, by means of various provident institutions, he has rendered the life of his employees very easy and comfortable, and has built excellent dwellings for them, of which they become proprietors after a few years. But the economic theories of the wealthy manufacturer of Schio have little, if anything, in common with Socialism; we must consider him rather as a prudent and philanthropic industrialist than as a Socialist.

But, as a rule, if we except the attempt made by Father Curci, which had no echo among the clergy, the Italian Catholics have always held themselves apart from the social movement. If any of them have taken an interest in social studies, and with less restricted views,[2] if a few priests have sought with admirable persistency to organise co-operative

[1] See Monsignor Giovanni Scalabrini, *L'emigrazione italiana in America*, second edition, Piacenza, 1888; *Il disegno di legge sulla emigrazione italiana*, Piacenza, 1888. See also R. Mazzei, "L'associazione di patronato per l'emigrazione," in the *Rassegna nazionale*, 1st June, 1889.

[2] See Toniolo, *Proposta di un ordine di studi e di azione sociale in Italia.* Bergamo, 1889.

societies,[1] Italian Catholics in general are not well disposed towards Socialism. The consequence is that Italian Socialism is daily assuming a more decidedly anti-religious character, and continues to consider the Church as an obstacle which must either be surmounted or destroyed, rather than as an institution that is favourable to its principles and tendencies.

On the other hand, the few Italian Catholics who have written on the social question have had no influence of any importance on the labour movement. Their works have scarcely even been read, and have had no effect in arousing the Italian public from their habitual indifference. In Italy, no bishop or Catholic in authority has openly taken part with the working classes, or entered into friendly relations with them. What wonder, then, if the Italian Socialists are, in general, avowed Atheists, and have no faith in the social action of the Church?

[1] See Charles Gide, *Du rôle pratique du pasteur dans les questions sociales*, p. 18. Paris, 1889. A few writers who have studied the social action of the clergy with benevolent intentions, have confined themselves to praising things of little or no importance. See Claude Jannet, *Les faits économiques et le mouvement social en Italie*, pp. 41-48. Paris: Larose et Farcel, 1889. On the action of the Italian clergy, their principles and tendencies, see my study, "Socialism and the Priesthood in Italy," in the *New Era*, June, 1892.

CHAPTER XII.

THE PAPACY AND THE SOCIAL QUESTION.

Socialists and Catholics—New Tendencies of Socialism—The Latest Congresses—Cardinal Manning and Liebknecht—The Catholics and the State—The Catholic Church and Socialism—Economic Views of Leo XIII.—Pastoral Letter of the Archbishop of Perugia—The Revolt of San Lupo and David Lazzaretti—Violent Character of Italian Socialism towards 1878—Encyclical Letter against Revolutionary Socialism—Causes which led to its Publication—Leo XIII. and Catholic Socialism—Address of Leo XIII. to the French Pilgrims—Views of Leo XIII. on the Social Question—Vatican Policy and Progress of Catholic Socialism—Progress and Victories of the Papacy—Mr. Stead's Prophecy—New Tendencies of the Papacy—Cause of the Increased Power of the Pope—Action of the Church—Socialism and Science—Socialism against Science—Socialism and the Church.

IN the face of this wide-spread Catholic Socialist agitation what has been the attitude of the Vatican? What are the personal views of Leo XIII.?

If, in the name of justice and religion, the Sovereign Pontiff permitted the late Cardinal Manning to support the necessity of the legal determination of the minimum wage and the maximum working day; if he has encouraged the *Œuvre des Cercles* in France, and has given his approval to the State Socialists, Ratzinger, Hitze and Vogelsang; if he allows Catholics, as in the case of Decurtins, to make common cause in matters of social reform with the most advanced Radicals; if, upon the intercession of Cardinal Gibbons, he not only recalled the excommunication of the Knights of Labour, but refrained from putting Henry George's books in the *Index*, it evidently means that between the principles of the Church and those of pacific, evolutionary Socialism, there is no absolutely open contradiction.

The evolution, in a practical and pacific direction, made by Socialism within the last few years has been most rapid. Not only have the Anarchists and revolutionary Socialists been greatly in the minority at all the more recent Socialist congresses, but they could not succeed in finding a hearing for their opinions, and everywhere met a current of thought contrary to their useless and criminal violence. Even in America the odious figure of Most is losing friends and followers, while in Europe the number of Bakunin's admirers is constantly diminishing.

In the various European States Socialism tends not only to become Conservative, but, in preference to their old system of isolated action, its partisans now join the political struggle, and take part in the parliamentary battles.

French Socialists have also, within these last years, abandoned the policy of violence, and tend to become a party working by legal means.[1] In England the practical Anglo-Saxon spirit is a preservative against the follies of Anarchism, and English Socialists, whether they follow the programme of Henry George or that of Mr. Hyndman, or carry on their movement by means of trade-unionism, are all far from sharing the violent tendencies of the democratic Socialists of other countries.[2] Socialism in the United States, having freed itself from many revolutionary elements, which had filtered in with German immigration, is daily becoming more and more of a constitutional party.[3]

But even in Germany, where after Marx Socialism had assumed a revolutionary attitude, the evolution in a conservative sense is constantly becoming more accentuated. The congress at Halle, in 1890, not only noticed the inopportuneness of useless revolutionary agitations, but admitted freedom of religion and the representative form of government, and

[1] Compare chapter x.

[2] Compare chapter xi.

[3] See article by the Socialist, L. Gronlund, "Le socialisme aux États-Unis," in the *Revue d'économie politique*, first year, pp. 109-124; and the book by A. Sartorius Von Waltherhausen, *Der moderne Socialismus in der Vereinigten Staaten von America*, p. 442, Berlin, Bahr, 1890.

advocated for the future a system resembling the Swiss *Referendum*. The German Socialists have now understood that as a means of propaganda violence is not a good method. The *Volksblatt*, transformed into the *Vorwärts*, said a year or two ago: "The conquest of political sovereignty cannot be accomplished in an instant, or by sudden revolution; it can only be realised by persevering efforts and through the action of Parliament. Bourgeois society was not created at one stroke, consequently it cannot be destroyed in a moment. It is a fortress with innumerable means of defence. An army that should try to take it by storm would be guilty of madness."[1]

Things have even reached this point, remarks an observant writer, that "when a Socialist leader wishes to rid himself of a colleague, he accuses him of being an Anarchist. 'Anarchist!' cries Bebel to Werner. 'Anarchist!' cries Liebknecht to Domela Niemvenhuys. 'Anarchist!' cries Mrs. Aveling to William Morris."[2]

If Democratic Socialism will but divest itself of its violent character, and renounce, as appears probable, its anti-religious principles, if it will recognise the necessity of the representative system of government, and abandon, in consequence, the insane violence it has heretofore employed, it is sure to meet with ever-increasing sympathy among Catholics.

Whatever may be the economic programme of modern Socialists, there is nothing contrary to it in the origins, traditions and principles of the Catholic Church. There are Catholic writers and economists whose programme of social reform is, from a certain point of view, no less utopistic or dangerous than that of the Democratic Socialists, and who, no less than they, wish to reform profoundly the basis of our economic organisation. A French economist, G. de Molinari, in stating the views of Cardinal Manning on the social question, exclaimed with surprise: "*M. Liebknecht lui-même ne va pas plus loin!*"[3]

[1] See the account of the congress at Halle, in the *Revue Bleue*, 23rd October, 1890.

[2] De Wyzewa, *op. cit.*, p. 334.

[3] See the "Chronique," by G. de Molinari, in the *Journal des Économistes*, p. 157, October, 1890.

The Catholic Socialists do not merely represent a tendency or indeterminate aspirations; their ideas are clear, precise, and sincere. The first bishops who accepted the criticisms of Socialism, and who, like Monsignor Ketteler, adhered in great part to Lassalle's programme, limited themselves, rather than anything else, to indicating the evil and signalling the danger. But their followers and successors have passed them by a long way; they are either thorough State Socialists, like Monsignor Bagshawe, or, like the late Cardinal Manning, the convinced supporters of the labouring classes. The young German school of the *Katheder-Socialisten* has recruited its most ardent followers, in Germany as in France and Austria, from among the Catholic clergy and Catholic writers. Abbé Hitze, De Mun, and Vogelsang have done nothing more than popularise and defend a thorough programme of State Socialism.

One of the pioneers of Catholic Socialism, the Austrian ex-Minister, Prince Von Lichtenstein, said one day before the *Reichsrath:* "Labour is not a private concern, but *a species of function which society delegates to each of its members.* The peasant who cultivates his land, the mechanic who toils in the workshop, are no less functionaries of society than the Government employee at his office or the soldier on the battle-field. Labour, like every other function, creates a series of reciprocal obligations between society which furnishes it and the workman who performs it. After this conception of it, how narrow seems the definition which reduces labour to a ware, subject to the law of supply and demand! . . ."[1]

Now, this theory, which raises labour to a social function, and would have it considered as independent of the law of supply and demand, this theory as fallacious in economics as it is alluring, is not the conception of Prince Lichtenstein alone, but is shared by a great part of the Catholic clergy and by almost all Catholic economists. It is not so very long since Cardinal Manning, a prince of the Church, whose magnanimity equalled his breadth of mind, boldly proclaimed this theory as true, and defended it with conviction.

[1] A. Villard, *Le socialisme moderne, Son dernier état*, p. 255. Paris: Guillaumin, 1887.

The Catholics who are opposed to, or refuse to admit, the legitimacy of State intervention in favour of the weakest and most oppressed in the social struggle, those who are disciples of the misnamed Darwinian school,[1] are not only very few in number and in opposition to the declarations of Leo XIII. himself, but are daily losing ground. At the Congress of Liége, in 1890, they represented but an insignificant minority. Indeed, several of them met with much the same treatment as John Huss at the Council of Constance. The Liberal orators spoke amidst general inattention and murmurs of impatience. When Father Caudron, seeking to defend the views of the classical school, argued for economic freedom, his speech merely provoked noisy disapproval, hisses, and the marked displeasure of those present.[2]

Now, these new tendencies among Catholics must not be considered as isolated manifestations.

It is from its system of organisation that the Catholic

[1] Darwin, whose personal views in politics were decidedly Radical, never conceived the idea of the non-intervention of State in social relations; it was supported only by a few of his disciples. Compare the important study by David G. Ritchie, *Darwinism and Politics*, p. 101. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1889. Compare also the study by M. A. Vaccaro, *La lutte pour l'éxistence, et ses effets dans l'humanité;* Lanessan, *La lutte pour l'éxistence, et l'association pour la lutte*, Paris, Doin; T. Kirkup, "Darwinism and Socialism," in the *Economic Review*, October, 1891. Besides, it is clearly evident that Spencer and other sociologists have erred in applying too rigorously to human society the principles of the struggle for life and of natural selection. In a future volume I hope to be able to demonstrate the many uncertainties and contradictions on this point into which the eminent English author has fallen.

[2] Compare the "Chronique" by G. de Molinari. This dissension between Catholics who admit State intervention in the social struggle and those who do not is becoming more accentuated every day. At the Liége Congress victory was on the side of the Interventionists. But a reaction came at once with the Social Congress of Angers, at which the late Monsignor Freppel, while severely blaming Cardinal Manning's letter, declared himself opposed to every species of Socialism, were it Democratic, State Socialism, or even Catholic Socialism. See in the review *Le XX^me^ Siècle* the articles "Flux et Reflux" and "Les deux Écoles de Sociologie Catholique," October, 1890.

Church derives its greatest strength. It is not possible that the vast Catholic Socialist movement, which has so firmly established itself in Europe and America, has been allowed to grow and expand without the aid, or at least the consent, of the Sovereign Pontiff. It is not possible that cardinals remarkable for their elevated position, that bishops and priests esteemed for their learning and high moral worth, can have embraced the doctrines of Socialism in opposition to the will of the Church.

Catholicism has accustomed its clergy and the faithful to passive, unconditional obedience. Many of the great schisms that took place in former times were brought about by the excessive dogmatic inflexibility of the Church, which never would, and will not even now, derogate from its programme and tendencies.[1]

Consequently, if in all this Catholic Socialist movement the Pope had noted the preponderance of principles contrary to those of the Church, he would not have allowed them thus to spread and dominate.

If, then, convinced Catholic Socialists, like the late Baron Von Vogelsang, Decurtins, De Mun, Hitze, Ratzinger, etc., have received continual and numerous marks of sympathy from the Sovereign Pontiff and from various princes of the Church, it evidently means that the Church has but little or nothing to oppose to the demands of evolutionary Socialism, and that it accepts, or at least does not consider unjust, the greater part of the claims of modern Socialists.

In the Lent of 1877, Leo XIII., who was then Cardinal Archbishop of Perugia, issued a pastoral letter which was much discussed, as being an ardent lyric to progress and

[1] Such is the spirit of obedience in the Church that M. Charles Périn, a learned economist and a disciple of Economic Liberalism, after the Encyclical Letter of the Pope, which proclaimed principles contrary to those he had professed, wrote: "*L'Église, voilà notre guide, notre vrai maître pour la question sociale; suivons la, et ne suivons qu'elle. N'ayons plus d'autre économie politique que celle qui découle de son enseignement social sur les questions des ouvriers.*" C. Périn, *L'économie politique d'après l'encyclique*, p. 28. Paris: Lecoffre, 1891.

science, and in which he treated of the necessity of democratic social legislation. "The modern schools of economics," wrote Cardinal Pecci, "have considered labour as the supreme end of man, whom they take into account as a machine of more or less value, according as he aids more or less in production. Hence no consideration for the normal man, and the colossal abuse that is made of the poor and lowly by those who seek to keep them in a state of dependence in order to grow rich at their expense. And even in countries which have the reputation of being the foremost in civilisation, what grave and repeated complaints do we not hear of the excessive hours of labour imposed on those who must earn their bread by the sweat of their brow? And does not the sight of the poor children, shut up in factories where, in the midst of their premature toil, consumption awaits them—does not this sight provoke words of burning indignation from every generous soul, and oblige Governments and Parliaments to make laws that can serve as a check to this inhuman traffic? And were it not for Catholic charity, which, with its asylums and various institutions, never ceases to provide relief to their misery, how many of these children would now-a-days be left without protection and abandoned to themselves by their fathers and mothers, whom the frenzy of labour drags from the domestic hearth! Oh! most beloved children, when we see these things or hear them related by organs that are above suspicion, we are impotent to contain the feeling of indignation which is ready to burst forth against those who are of opinion that the destinies of civilisation should be entrusted to the hands of these barbarians. And they call this 'encouraging progress!' But there is still worse: this labour without measure, which exhausts and wears out the body, is at the same time the ruin of the soul, from which, little by little, it cancels all traces of resemblance with God; this rage of keeping men riveted down to matter, steeped in it, absorbed by it, benumbs all intellectual life in these wretched victims of labour, flung back into paganism. All that which can ennoble man and make him heir to heaven, as God wishes he should be, fades from their sight and is forgotten, leaving only in exchange animal

instincts, thenceforth intolerant of any curb. In the presence of these beings, prematurely exhausted by heartless avarice, we ask if, instead of making us progress, these adepts of a civilisation without God and outside the Church, are not rather driving us many centuries back, back to those sad times when so great a part of the human race lay crushed in slavery, and of which the poet sorrowfully cried: 'The human race lives only in a few! *Humanum paucis vivit genus!*'"[1]

Yet notwithstanding, only a year after his pastoral letter to the faithful of Perugia, Gioacchino Pecci, who had been elected Pope on the 28th December, 1878, issued his celebrated encyclical against Socialism,[2] denouncing "the deadly pestilence, which, insinuating itself into the innermost fibres of society, is reducing it to extreme danger of ruin," and pointing out "the most efficacious means of restoring it to health and saving it from the impending peril".

But, in 1878, Leo XIII. was very ill-disposed towards Socialism. The remedies which he indicates against the "deadly pestilence" prove that he must have been deeply irritated against Social Democracy, the power of which he sought to weaken, rather than to judge its tendencies and aspirations with calm discernment.

Leo XIII. recognises in kings and priests the right to command by Divine law; he would fain see the schools in

[1] Not having been able to procure the Pastoral Letter of Cardinal Pecci in Italian, I have been obliged to translate it, comparing together the German and French Reviews in which it had been reproduced at the time. When Cardinal Pecci became Pope the views expressed in his Pastoral Letter of 1877 were largely discussed by economists. See the article by G. de Molinari in the *Journal des économistes*, March, 1878, "Léon XIII. économiste," and the address delivered on the same subject by Joseph Garnier at the *Société d'économie politique*, 6th March, 1878, and published in the review of the same name, p. 442 and following. In 1844 Count Pellegrino Rossi was charged by this society to present a letter to the Popé, inviting him to introduce the study of political economy into the religious seminaries. Pius IX. accepted the proposal with pleasure. However, after the assassination of Count Rossi, he either forgot his promise or would no longer hear of it.

[2] See appendix i.

which the young generations are trained restored to the guidance of the clergy; he maintains that the Catholic Church and the Roman Pontiff are the basis and foundation of all civilised society, and that "the reasons of religion and those of empire are so intimately united, that if the first fall into decay the majesty of command must necessarily diminish"; he considers it necessary that the working classes return to religion, and, pointing out the evils of revolutionary Socialism, Anarchism, and Communism, maintains that working-men's associations should be placed under the protection of religion. Predisposed by his views and convictions to consider the greater part of the evils that afflict modern States as due to the fatal infiltration of secret societies and factions, Leo XIII. does not attempt to disguise his persuasion that Socialism also is a result of the seditious spirit of the present day.

The pastoral letter of the Cardinal Archbishop of Perugia was sincerely and Christianly democratic. Recognising the evils that afflict the working classes, he pointed out the dangers of a social system based upon injustice. Not even a year had elapsed before the encyclical, written by the same hand that had traced the democratic pastoral letter to the faithful of Perugia, seemed almost to repudiate the most justifiable aspirations of Socialism. What social events could have produced so sudden a change?

During the first year of his pontificate, Leo XIII. had been profoundly grieved by the occurrence of events by which public order and social tranquillity were for a time disturbed. The Sovereign Pontiff beheld with sorrow, and especially in Italy, revolutionary Socialism threaten the existence of the State, and attempt to destroy the very basis of civilised society. Even the criminal attempts of Barsanti and Passanante contributed to make him judge with extreme severity the action of all Socialist sects.[1]

It is necessary to remind the reader that revolutionary Socialism, which had been transplanted into Italy by Bakunin,

[1] Passanante, the cook who made an attempt on the life of King Humbert of Italy, was not a Socialist, but a madman. He is now confined in a criminal madhouse.

had assumed about that time in Romagna, Venetia and Naples a thoroughly Nihilistic character. In the programmes of the Anarchist associations, tolerated through the weakness of Government, there was no longer any question of the claims of labour, or of pacific aspirations, but of destruction, and revolution. Every day new sects arose, the very names of which were a programme in themselves; they were: *La Mano nera*, *La Dinamite*, *Morte ai Borghesi* (Death to the Bourgeois), etc. The Committee of Accusation at the Congress of the Hague had already recognised that in Italy the Socialist alliance was not a "labour association, but a rabble having no defined position, the dregs of the bourgeoisie" (*une tourbe de déclassés*, *la lie de la bourgeoisie*).

The Italian Socialists were wanting in any species of scientific culture, and more accustomed to turbulent, factious conspiracy than to peaceable discussion; they presented a strange jumble of Communism and Individualism, maintained the abolition of the State, the abolition of the Church and of all religion, the suppression of property and the abolition of every form of magistracy. Moreover, they demanded the immediate realisation of their views, by any and every means.[1]

Bakunin had conceived the type of the revolutionary as a man who is bound by no ties of any description, who has no personal interests, no business, no feelings, no property. According to the criminal apostle of Nihilism the revolutionary ought to be entirely absorbed by one single passion: revolution; by one single aim: destruction. He ought to despise existing morality, and to molest actual society with incessant and irreconcilable hatred. Modern science is but vain rhetoric. The brigand is the true hero, the vindicator of the people, the irreconcilable enemy of the State. Infatuated as he is by his programme of pan-destruction, Bakunin admits no other

[1] Compare E. de Laveleye, *Le socialisme contemporain*, p. 256 and following, and *Lettres d'Italie*, pp. 185-197 and 375-382, Milan, 1880; Meyer, *Der Emancipations-Kampf der vierten Standes*; Ludwig Richter, *Jahrbuch der Socialwissenschaft*, 1878 and 1880; E. Forni, *L'Internazionale e lo Stato*. See also L. Accorsant, *Le Socialisme, voilà l'ennemi*, p. 57 and following. Paris: Retaux-Bray, 1891.

activity than that of destruction, no other aim than that of revolution.[1] He would have no honest, legal agitation to arouse the people, but a series of assassinations and outrages to convince the masses of the triumph of the revolution.

After his escape from Siberia, Bakunin recruited the greater number of his followers in Spain and Italy. The natural tendency to exaggeration and the factious spirit of the Latin races, the traditions of brigandage and the extreme ignorance of the masses, rendered possible a relatively wide diffusion of the views and programme of this apostle of Nihilism. And thus the disastrous effects of the Bakuninist agitation were not long in manifesting themselves in both peninsulas by a succession of outrages, violences, and murders. The Italian anarchical clubs, composed of hot-headed men, mostly devoid of all culture, had no other programme than that of the turbulent Nihilist, who bore in his heart from the frozen Steppes of Siberia the fever of hatred and destruction.[2]

But it was not by Anarchist agitations alone that the heart of the Sovereign Pontiff had been afflicted. The clergy of the Italian country parishes, for the most part poor, ignorant, and hostile to the new order of things which had stripped them at the same time of power and possessions, not only frequently allowed the evil of Anarchism to spread without combating or opposing it, but in a few instances went even so far as to take part in the Anarchist insurrections.

In the rising led by David Lazzaretti, which was of an entirely religious character, and assumed the form of thorough mystic Communism, two priests were among the most convinced followers of the unfortunate prophet of Arcidosso.

Although the mystical carter was dominated by a religious ideal, he was, nevertheless, infatuated by a species of Communism based on fraternity and mysticism. In his statute of the *Società delle famiglie cristiane* he spoke emphatically of the community of goods, prescribing regulations for the distribution of the profits of such goods, in ratio to the amount of

[1] Laveleye, *op. cit.*, pp. 227-242.

[2] See also the apologetic *Notes sur Bakounine*, p. 16. Barnaud, Foix.

capital or labour put into the common stock by each member.[1] If Lazzaretti was personally dominated by an ideal of religious, rather than of economic reform, yet the principles which he diffused and maintained up to the time of his tragical death at the foot of Monte Labbro, and the theories existing among his adherents, gave a decidedly Socialistic character to the Lazzarettist movement.[2]

A year before the poor prophet of Arcidosso ended his life so miserably in the very locality where he had sought to create and diffuse a new religion, an attempt at anarchical insurrection was made in the province of Benevento, in which two country parish priests took a most active part.

On the 5th of April, 1877, a band of about thirty persons, instigated by some revolutionaries from the Romagna, met in a house which they had hired, in the village of San Lupo, near Benevento. On the night of the 6th, the carabineers, who were watching the house, were fired at, and two of them were severely wounded. The band then formed into marching order, and, with a red-and-black flag at their head, proceeded to the mountains of Matese, and in the name of the Social Revolution occupied the neighbouring village of Letino by armed force. They seized the municipality, set fire to all the papers and the civil registers, proclaimed the Social Revolution and the fall of the king, and ordered the partition of the land.

While the papers were burning at the foot of the cross, which, as in almost all the villages in the South of Italy, stood in the market-place, a priest of Letino, named Fortini, who was also a municipal councillor, mounting on the pedestal of the cross, proclaimed the triumph of justice, presented the insurgents to his flock as the true apostles of the Lord, as persons desirous of restoring social equality according to the precepts of the Gospel. Then, placing himself at the head of

[1] On Lazzaretti, his life and views, see the excellent study by G. Barzellotti in *Santi, solitari e filosofi*, second edition. Bologna: Zanichelli, 1880. The same author treats also of the Communism of the Lazzarettists, see p. 131.

[2] G. Barzellotti, *op. cit.*

the band, he led them to the neighbouring village of Gallo, amid shouts of "Long live the Social Revolution!" The peasants of Gallo welcomed the Anarchists with delight. Tamburrini, the parish priest, joined the band, blessed them, and reassured his people, presenting the Anarchists as liberators, and proclaiming social emancipation and the end of all inequality and injustice. When the troops approached, and the insurgents fled to the forest of Matese, the two priests accompanied them; and when, in 1878, the Anarchists appeared before the assizes of Capua, among the thirty-seven prisoners, side by side with Malatesta, Cafiero, and other noted internationalists, were the two priests of Letino and Gallo.[1]

It was these events, and the extreme violence of the Anarchists, who hesitated before no crime, that grieved the Sovereign Pontiff to the soul, and determined him, towards the end of 1878, to issue his celebrated encyclical letter denouncing Socialism. The Pontiff confounded Anarchists and Socialists together in one same judgment and one same sentence. The outrages committed by the Anarchists, who had even dared to throw dynamite into a church full of humble and devout worshippers, who had defied every law, and had wantonly spread terror among the peaceable population of Tuscany, naturally predisposed the Pontiff's mind against all socialistic claims; and, in the encyclical of 1878, he severely condemned those who "diversis ac pene barbaris nominibus Socialistæ, Communistæ vel Nihilistæ appelantur, quique per universum orbem diffusi, et iniquo inter se fœdere colligati, non amplius ab occultorum conventuum tenebris præsidium quærunt, sed palam fidenterque in lucem prodeuntes, quod jampridem inierunt consilium cuiuslibet civilis societatis fundamenta convellendi, perficere adnituntur. Ii nimirum sunt, qui, prout divina testantur eloquia, carnem quidem maculant, dominationem spernunt, majestatem autem blasphemant. Nihil, quod humanis divinisque legibus ad vitæ incolumitatem

[1] On the insurrection of San Lupo, see A. Bertolini, in the preface to Mr. J. Rae's *Contemporary Socialism*, Swan Sonnenschein & Co.; E. de Laveleye, *Le socialisme contemporain*, pp. 258 and 259, and *Lettres d'Italie*, p. 188 and following.

et decus sapienter decretum est, intactum vel integrum relinquunt."

But when Socialism became less turbulent and violent in Italy and the other Latin nations, when from all sides Leo XIII. heard the echo of the socialistic movement, when in the populous cities of the United States as in the Green Isle of Misery, in free Switzerland as in unhappy Poland, he beheld Catholic bishops accept, almost always without restrictions, the theories of Socialism; when he saw the Catholics of France, Germany, and Austria support with ardour thoroughly socialistic programmes, he readily understood how much it behoved him not to abandon the study of the social question to the adversaries of religion. And in Austria he conferred his blessing upon the Catholic Socialist, the late Baron Von Vogelsang, encouraged the social work of Count de Mun in France, took the part of the Irish peasantry, revoked the excommunication passed on the Knights of Labour, permitted Catholics to read the works of Henry George, encouraged the Socialist clergy of Germany, lent his aid to the action of Cardinal Mermillod and Gaspard Decurtins in Switzerland, and finally, did not put in the *Index* any of the numerous Catholic writers who had embraced and supported socialistic principles.

The first step towards the Catholic Socialists made by Leo XIII. was his address to the second pilgrimage of French workmen. Before that, at a public reception held in his yresence, the Sovereign Pontiff had already allowed the late Cardinal Mermillod, then Bishop of Lausanne and Fribourg, to speak of the abuses of labour and the slavery of the working classes with truly Lassallian frankness.

In his address to the French workmen in October, 1889, Leo XIII. spoke words of peace, recommending tranquillity and submission. He declared that the upper classes were bound to treat the poor with paternal benevolence, and to place a check on the insatiable thirst for wealth, pleasure, and luxury which constantly tends to increase. He commanded employers to consider their work people as brothers, "to ease their lot within the limits of possibility, and by offering them fair terms, to watch over their interests, both spiritual and temporal,

to edify them with the example of a Christian life, and, above all, never to depart from the rules of equity and justice in view of rapid and disproportionate gains and profits"; and the workmen he recommended to love and respect their employers, to submit with resignation to the irksome consequences of labour, and to abstain from all acts tending to disturb public tranquillity. "What we ask of you," said the Sovereign Pontiff, "is to cement anew the social edifice by returning to the spirit and doctrines of Christianity, reviving, at least in substance, in their manifold and beneficent attributes and under such forms as the new conditions of our times admit of, those corporations of arts and trades, founded upon a Christian ideal and inspired by the maternal solicitude of the Church, which formerly provided for the material and religious needs of the working classes, facilitated their labour, took care of their savings and economies, defended their rights, and supported in due measure their legitimate demands."[1]

Of a truth, the Sovereign Pontiff, while he did not approve with over-hastily formed judgment of any change in the relations between capital and labour, showed himself, as he still is, biassed in favour of the anti-Liberal dream of many Catholic Socialists, who would have, at any cost, the restoration of the old guilds. This anti-Liberal dream was shared also by Bismarck, who considered it the best means for improving the condition of the labouring classes.

And yet though in former times the guild system represented a very advanced form of social organisation, it is now-a-days utterly unadaptable to the immense progress made by production and modern industry. No one can now believe that a return to the obsolete guild system can restore peace in the domain of labour. The guilds, which were almost invariably organised in the interest of the master, to whom they assured an unfair monopoly, exercised the most grievous tyranny over the workman, depriving him of all liberty, and by no means freeing him from those laws of competition against which Catholic Socialists and State Socialists alike rise up with so much violence.

[1] See appendix ii.

From the encyclical letter of the 28th December, 1878, in which the Sovereign Pontiff denounced Radical Socialism as that "*lethiferam pestem*," to the allocution addressed to the French pilgrims, in which he recommended peace and concord between workmen and employers, declaring that the latter commit an act of injustice when they aim at realising "rapid and disproportionate gains and profits," he had already advanced a step towards the Catholic Socialists.

But events compelled him to interest himself yet more directly in the social question.

Even had he wished, the Pontiff could not neglect the Socialist movement and leave the solving of this most important question to social democracy. Echoes of the struggle carried on throughout the world by the clergy and faithful of the Catholic Church reached his ears every day. He saw dignitaries of the Church, like the late Cardinal Manning, stand up to defend the minimum wage, the determination of the maximum working day, the international regulation of labour; he saw eminent Catholics, like Decurtins, Vogelsang, and Hitze, not only stigmatise capitalism and the present industrial organisation of society, but defend a thorough programme of State Socialism. In the midst of the dissension which separated Catholics, arming them against each other on the ground of social reforms, and which, especially in Central Europe, was a cause of incessant and continual strife, the Pope perceived how necessary it was that he should pronounce a word having power to restrain within bounds the overflowing torrent.

The encyclical letter of the 15th of May, 1891, reflects to a great extent the views on the social question current in the Vatican. The moment at which it was issued, the condition of things from which it originated, and the circumstances under which it was published, give it a very high importance not only in the eyes of Catholics, but in the eyes of all students of social science.

According to the Sovereign Pontiff, the social question is difficult and not free from danger: difficult inasmuch as it is no easy thing to define the relative rights and the mutual

duties of the wealthy and the poor, of capital and labour; dangerous, because crafty and turbulent agitators constantly make use of such questions to pervert men's judgment and to stir up the people to sedition. The Papal encyclical declares that the labouring classes are now left "isolated and defenceless at the mercy of the callousness of employers and the greed of the most unrestrained competition". The abolition of the guilds, usury, competition, the monopoly of production and trade have combined to render it possible to "a very limited number of excessively wealthy men to impose on the infinite multitude of the proletarians a yoke little better than slavery itself".

The Sovereign Pontiff, after having recognised the evil in terms almost as severe as those used by the Socialists, condemns, however, the latter for seeking to abolish private property, which he considers as a natural right. Nor does he admit that in order to remedy the evil by which modern society is afflicted "it is necessary to invoke the protection of the State; man is older than the State, and nature gave him the right to provide for the life of his body prior to the formation of any State".

Neither does he esteem it less dangerous that the State intervene in family relations, "for since domestic communion is logically and historically prior to all civil communities, its rights and duties are founded on nature, and should consequently have the precedence."

If, then, private property should not be suppressed, if the intervention of the State should have its limits, what remedies must we oppose to the ills of society?

As human inequality is inevitable, so also is suffering, and "all striving against nature is vain". Absolute equality and absolute and general prosperity are alike impossible. Pain and sorrow will never be wanting on earth, for "to suffer and endure is man's heritage; let men try as they may, no power, no artifice can ever banish from human life the ills and sorrows to which it is subject. If any there are who pretend the contrary, who promise to the hard-pressed masses a life free from pain and trouble, nothing but peace and coustant

enjoyment, they but deceive the people and impose upon them, and their false promises will only lead to still graver evils than those at present existing. It were better to look at human things as they really are, and at the same time seek elsewhere a remedy to these troubles."[1]

It is a great mistake to think that the higher and lower classes of society are naturally hostile to each other. "The one stands in need of the other: capital cannot exist without labour, nor labour without capital." In order that this harmony be maintained, it is absolutely necessary that both labourers and capitalists faithfully observe their mutual duties. "The duties of justice on the part of the workman and proletarian are as follows: to supply faithfully and entirely the labour for which he has freely and equitably contracted; not to injure his employer in his goods or by offence offered to his person; to abstain from all acts of violence in defending his own person or rights, and never to let such defence degenerate into rebellion; to have no intercourse with evil men who promise great things, which would only result in useless sufferings and ruinous losses. The duties of capitalists and employers are: not to consider their workmen as slaves; to respect in them the dignity of the human person ennobled by the Christian character." Consequently, they must not abuse their work people, nor demand of them efforts superior to their age and sex, nor defraud them of just remuneration.[2] "In order to determine this remuneration in an equitable manner, it is necessary to take many things into consideration; but, as

[1] The Sovereign Pontiff does not seem to have a clear idea of Socialism when he believes that it tends to reduce all *private property* in common, "Sed in hoc plane, facile intelligitur, rerum dominium vel *moventium* vel solidarum consistit. In eo igitur quod *bona* privatorum transferre socialistæ ad commune nituntur. . . ." Moreover, it is not exact that the Socialists think that the triumph of their principles will mark an era of general happiness and prosperity. The causes of sorrow are not solely economic.

[2] Who can say exactly in what "just remuneration" consists? The Pontiff himself confesses that even in Biblical times the labourers were defrauded of their just hire, "*Ecce merces operariorum . . . quæ fraudata est a vobis clamat*" (St. James, v. 4).

a rule, capitalists and employers should bear in mind that no laws, human or Divine, permit them to oppress the poor and needy in view of their own interests, and to trade upon the misery of their fellow-creatures. And to defraud any one of the salary due to him is so grave a sin that it calls down vengeance from heaven."

But, according to the Sovereign Pontiff, the Church should not be satisfied with merely pointing out the remedy, but must seek to apply it.

The State, which is "one harmonious unity, embracing alike the highest and lowest grades" of men, should above all have care of the labouring classes. The workman should have his share in the enjoyment of the wealth he has produced: "Consequently, all that which can in any way improve his condition should be favoured as much as possible, in the assurance that this solicitude, far from injuring any one, will be for the good of all, as it is in the general interest that those from whom we receive such important advantages should not be condemned to misery".

The laws should above all protect the masses, "who, having no means of defence, stand in special need of the protection of the State". It should, therefore, safeguard not only the welfare of their souls by assuring them the exercise of their religion, but likewise their corporal and exterior prosperity. "The first duty of the State is to save the unhappy workman from the inhumanity of greedy speculators, who, for the sake of gain, abuse, without any discretion, living beings as though they were mere inanimate things. It is not just to demand of a man so much labour as to weaken both mind and body by overwork." Labour should be proportionate to the labourer, be it man, woman, or child, and the period of rest allowed to the labourer should be in proportion to the amount of strength expended in labour, inasmuch as the strength consumed by exertion should be restored by rest.

It is usually believed that the amount of wage is freely contracted with the consent of both sides, "so that once the employer has paid the wage he has fulfilled his part of the

contract, and apparently owes nothing further".[1] Now, to look at the matter in this manner means to consider labour under its *personal* aspect only. If the workman, "compelled by necessity or by fear of worse evils, accepts harder terms, which, because they are imposed on him by the proprietor or contractor, he is forced to accept whether he will or not, he is made to suffer violence, against which justice protests". And though it is preferable in similar cases to appeal to the decision of the guilds, in case of need the State can be called in to strengthen such decisions with its support and protection.

Legislation should favour the formation and development of small properties. "The revolution," says the Sovereign Pontiff, "has divided society into two castes, between which it has opened an immense abyss. On one side a faction which is all-powerful because of its great riches; which, having in its hands every branch of production and commerce, is able to exploit to its own profit all the sources of wealth, and to exercise, moreover, a preponderating influence in the administration of the State. On the other, a weak and miserable multitude, whose ulcerated soul is ever ready for rebellion. Now, if with the hope of being able to acquire some property, the spirit of industry were but encouraged in this multitude, the great distance between excessive poverty and excessive wealth would be lessened, and the two classes gradually drawn nearer to one another."

Much might be effected towards the solving of the labour problem by those institutions destined to provide for the indigent and by societies of mutual aid. "First in order, however, come the guilds of arts and trades, which comprehend almost all the others. The advantages which these guilds procured to our forefathers are most manifest, and not only

[1] "We speak of freedom of contract, and a few ask, Whom have we defrauded? were not our contracts freely made? and, if free, are they not legal? But what liberty can there be between irresponsible wealth and needy poverty? Is it not 'to accept and not to eat'?" Thus did the late Cardinal Manning express himself in an interesting article on the responsibility of wealth, published in the *Nineteenth Century*, December, 1890.

were they of great utility to artisans, but contributed greatly to the dignity and advancement of the higher arts, as a number of existing monuments still attest. The greater culture of our times, new customs, and the increased requirements of daily life render it necessary that these guilds be adapted to present conditions." These associations of labour should keep apart from all vain agitations, should be animated by a religious spirit, and finally, should attend to the wants and interests of the labouring classes.

"They will have for result another advantage," continues the Sovereign Pontiff, "in affording hope and a means of amendment to those workmen who have abandoned the Christian faith, or who live contrary to its teachings. They understand, for the most part, that they have been deceived by false hopes and specious illusions. They feel that they are being treated in a most inhumane manner by greedy employers, who barely consider them more than the produce of their labour; that in the societies to which they belong, instead of charity and fraternal affection, there exists but internal discord —the inseparable companion of petulant and unbelieving poverty. Worn out in body, and weary in soul, how willinaly would they shake off such abject slavery, but through human respect or for fear of poverty, they dare not. Now, what salutary effects might not the Catholic guilds procure to such as these, if, in facilitating the way to their hesitating steps, they invited them to join the association, and seeing them amend, they took them under their protection."

All things considered, although the Papal encyclical condemns the privileges of capitalism and deplores the condition of the working classes, it proposes remedies which stand in no correlation to the gravity of the evils it bewails. Leo XIII. believes that the social reform should be, above all and almost exclusively, a moral reform, and that with the sole aid of spiritual forces Catholicism can oppose a barrier to the precipitous torrent of Socialism, and at the same time establish between capitalists and work people those equitable relations which can alone restore peace in the domain of labour.

At bottom the Pontiff, while wishing to see Sunday rest,

the minimum wage, and the maximum working day fully assured to the workman, would have these things brought about through the action of associations among the work people rather than through the mediation of the State. The mere fact that the guilds of arts and trades, which no longer enjoy the rights and privileges formerly belonging to them, may have occasionally given moderately good results in France or Austria does not furnish sufficient argument to believe that the guild system, which is contrary to the doctrines of modern science and to all the tendencies of modern industrial life, can produce the excellent results in which the Sovereign Pontiff has apparently so firm a faith.

But which form of guild does the Pontiff wish to restore?

Does he desire a return to the close guilds, and, like Count de Mun, see no means of salvation outside of them? or does he accept the views of another eminent Catholic, M. Charles Périn, and prefer the free guilds?

Leo XIII. has not yet pronounced himself nor cast his decisive word into the great contest which divides, on this point, the Catholics of Central Europe.

And indeed the encyclical on the labour question, as also the famous address to the French pilgrims, contains but vague and indefinite affirmations.

To condemn as an offence against the rights of property any attempt at change in the relations between capital and labour is an error which the tendencies of many Catholics have amply contradicted. No form of economic organisation can resist the wear of centuries without, as a consequence of natural evolution, undergoing some transformation.

The passage from slavery to free labour constituted an economic revolution far more profound than that which would in any case be the result of the passage from hired labour to the sharing of the profits of labour by the workers. Why, therefore, condemn an evolution which some day must necessarily take place, and which we can in no way prevent?

All the tendencies of modern economic and social legislation, be they what they may, incline to limit the rights of property, divesting it of its old individualistic form, and

adapting it to the requirements of our times. There exists now no right of property which is not subject to certain limitations in view of the general interest.

Now, it cannot but be an error to condemn any modification whatever of this right, which, of itself, tends towards a change of form, and is daily subject to new limitations.

A large portion of the clergy of France, Germany, England, and America, have on this point outstepped not a little the views of Leo XIII. Nor is it probable that they will turn back when they perceive they have gone beyond the limits marked by the Pope in his encyclical letter.

Among the many facts that support this affirmation it will suffice to refer to two only.

When the Pope, in accordance with the request of the English Government, ordered the Irish bishops to abandon the cause of the poor tenantry, and to support instead that of the landlords, the Irish clergy did not obey the order thus given them. The Pope had been actuated by the necessity for maintaining a good understanding with England, but the Irish bishops and clergy did not, and would not, understand political reasons. Not wishing to estrange the love of the people, and knowing that the Pontiff had not taken into account the wishes of his Irish legate, Monsignor Persico, they refused to obey the Pontifical rescript, and acted according to their own natural tendencies and feelings.[1]

In the United States, not a small number of the Catholic clergy became ardent supporters of the theories of Henry George. Archbishop Corrigan persuaded the Pope to excommunicate Dr. MacGlynn, the leader of the Labour party, and at that time a warm defender and supporter of land nationalisation. Notwithstanding this, a good number of the clergy, particularly in New York, continued to uphold and diffuse George's ideas,[2] and the

[1] Cp. the excellent article by E. de Laveleye on "L'avenir de la Papauté," in the *Revue Internationale*, 15th January, 1890.

[2] See the article by the American Socialist, Thomas R. Preston, "La riforma fondiaria in America," in the *Giornale degli economisti*, August, 1890.

decree of excommunication passed on Dr. MacGlynn has recently been withdrawn.

The German clergy, who are also obliged to combat Social Democracy, the scepticism of the National Liberal party, and the excessive demands of the Conservatives, are bound, if they would retain the affection of the people, to defend a great part of the socialist programme they hitherto supported. Nor in free countries, like Switzerland, England, and the United States of America, where they must vie with the Socialism of the various Protestant communions and mix with persons trained to democratic independence, is it possible for the Catholic clergy to renounce the programme that has been traced out to them by men like Decurtins, Cardinal Gibbons, the late Cardinal Manning, etc.

As in the past the Church has hardly ever opposed the action of Catholic Socialism, neither can it do so in the future And if in his encyclical on the labour question the Sovereign Pontiff shows extreme caution and expresses views less advanced than those held by a large number of the clergy, it is that his voice has the weight of an absolute moral and spiritual law for over two hundred and thirty millions of Catholics; and Leo XIII. could not, without precipitating events, adopt the same language as Cardinal Manning and many other Catholic bishops.

Besides, it must be remembered that, the dogma of Papal Infallibility having once been proclaimed, the Pontiff could not in his encyclical use the same language as Cardinal Manning or Cardinal Gibbons. The pastoral letters of these two eminent divines oblige no one, and even good Catholics may dissent from them; but for the clergy, as for the faithful, a Papal encyclical bears a truly absolute character of moral obligation.

Nevertheless the Church feels more and more the urgency of accepting whatever there is of good and sound in the doctrines of Socialism, and of winning the love and attachment of the popular classes by taking up their defence and protecting their interests. The more the sceptical and unbelieving bourgeoisie, infected by Liberal doctrines, falls away from the principles of the Church, the more imperious for the latter

becomes the necessity of strengthening its influence over the masses.

The late Cardinal Manning proclaimed aloud and with great sincerity this new necessity of the Church. "The world," he said, "is no longer governed by dynasties; the Holy See must now treat with the people. The more this is clearly and fully recognised, the more freely will the Church be able to exercise its spiritual authority."[1]

And in consequence of this a number of bishops—for the most part guided by sincerely Christian motives, but also frequently impelled by the necessity of things—have applied themselves with large views and truly democratic appreciations to the study of those problems to which the masses attach the greatest interest, and in the solution of which they have placed their highest hopes. The more the bourgeoisie falls away from the faith, the more the Church seeks to establish a firm hold on the hearts of the people.

The social doctrines which, in the name of Christian morality, many bishops of Germany, Austria, England, and the United States support and defend, aim, for the most part, at modifying the present order of society no less profoundly than those professed by the Social Democrats.

The movement due to the large initiative of Monsignor Ketteler has been most fruitful in results, and has urged the German clergy more and more towards socialistic aspirations. When they organised the Catholic Socialist associations of working men to serve as a powerful electoral arm, the sceptical writers of the German Liberal school refused to see in this mighty combination anything more than an arm to aid in assuring the triumph of the Church. After twenty years' experience it is no longer permissible to maintain so unjust an opinion, now that throughout a great part of Germany Catholic Absolutism has entered into alliance with the levelling Social Democratic party.

In their common distrust of Liberal institutions, in their common aversion for the present social organisation, the

[1] See the preceding chapter.

Socialists and the Catholic clergy find well-prepared ground for common action.

The Socialists no longer entertain that violent, unreasoning hatred towards the Church which animated the turbulent revolutionary Socialists of the beginning of the century. German Social Democracy considers religion as a private affair, *Privatsache.* The leaders of their party, who are for the most part Atheists, make no anti-religious propaganda, and refrain from those vulgar insults against religion which very frequently form the melancholy prerogative of French and Italian Socialism. "In the course of my long political life," said the deputy Liebknecht at the Congress of Halle, "I have learned that a believer can never be shaken by attacks or insults offered to his religion. We can only root out religion by confronting it with knowledge. We must mobilise the school against the Church, the teacher against the priest; an enlightened education alienates the mind from religion. Attacks but invigorate the champion; and those amongst us who declare war to religion repeat the error which the Prussian Government committed with regard to the Catholic Church, they but strengthen the enemy."[1]

But although the leaders of Socialism are almost all Atheists, Atheism, does not form part of their programme. Consequently, in Germany, and more particularly in the country districts, not a few Catholic priests defend the Socialist programme more or less openly.

According to some recent interpretations of the New Testament by Protestant divines, the woman sitting upon the scarlet-coloured beast of the Apocalypse, and clothed with purple and scarlet, is but the Papacy, which, the better to subdue kings and peoples, assumes the red robe of Socialism and leagues itself with Social Democracy.[2]

Yet, leaving aside this singular and unlikely interpretation, it is undeniable that an imperious historic necessity now compels the Papacy to take up a very different policy to that

[1] See the acts of the Congress of Halle (12th-18th October, 1890), pp. 174 and 201.

[2] Cp. Laveleye, 'L'avenir de la Papauté," as above cited.

which it has hitherto followed, and that the Catholic Church, whose power is daily increasing, is bound, in order to maintain its character of catholicity, not to stand aloof from Socialism, which is the most catholic or universal fact existing in the modern world.

A few years ago an able and well-known English writer, Mr. W. T. Stead, published "a revelation and a prophecy" on the future of the Papacy.[1]

According to Mr. Stead, the Papacy will one day be able to realise its old dream of dominating the entire world, but only on two conditions: it must put itself at the head of the Socialist Democratic movement that is attracting all modern civilisation, and, abandoning Rome, it must cease to be Italian, and become Anglo-Saxon, for, according to Mr. Stead, the world of the future belongs to the Anglo-Saxon races, who will become masters of the greater part of America, Asia, Africa and Australia.[2]

Two years previously, in the most important and most largely read of the French reviews, Viscount de Vogüé, a French Legitimist writer, expressed equal confidence in the future of the Papacy. After having noted how within late years the power of the Sovereign Pontiff had greatly increased, and the tendency of the Church to become more and more democratic, and to embrace a large part of the doctrines of Socialism, he predicted that were the Pope to endeavour to reunite the Greek and Roman Churches, permitting the Christians of the East to retain their liturgical differences, and,

[1] The article published in the August number of the *Contemporary Review*, 1889, was anonymous, and bore the title, "The Papacy: a Revelation and a Prophecy". Later on it was known that the anonymous writer was Mr. Stead, then editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*.

[2] In November, 1889, Mr. Stead passed some time in Rome, so as to have an opportunity of better observing the attitude of the Vatican, but he returned to London disappointed, for it appeared to him that Leo XIII. was much more preoccupied by the question of temporal power than by the idea of putting himself at the head of Democratic Socialism, much less that of Anglo-Saxonising himself. Cp. Laveleye, "L'avenir de la Papauté," in the *Revue Internationale*, 15th January, 1890.

following the Socialist-Democratic current, boldly take up the defence of the labouring classes, he would undoubtedly become master of the world, and realise the long-cherished dream of his predecessors.[1]

Even setting aside these forcasts of the future, no one can refuse to admit that the power of the Papacy is now much greater than it has been in the last few centuries. The fall of the temporal power and the introduction of the representative parliamentary system and of universal suffrage in almost all civilised States, have given the Sovereign Pontiff most extraordinary power and an undeniable influence over the politics of the whole world.

So long as the Pope was but the puny sovereign of a small territory, he was obliged to maintain the same attitude as all other temporal sovereigns, or, in other words, modify his spiritual action according to the interests of the small Pontifical States. The history of the Papacy from Charlemagne down to our days clearly proves that all the errors, faults, and weaknesses came from the desire to preserve and extend the temporal dominion.[2] And even Pius IX., in view of the wants of his States, abandoned the unfortunate Catholics of Poland to Russian tyranny, and refrained from raising his voice in defence of the Irish Catholics.

And now the temporal dominion of the Popes is at an end for ever. But Catholics should rejoice at this loss as at one of their victories. The ecclesiastical principality of Rome has, after a long resistance, been absorbed by the national movement, in the same manner as were those of Cologne, Liége, Mayence, etc., during the middle ages.

At the present day the Papacy is more independent than it has ever been. When the Pope was Sovereign of Rome—that is to say, of a small State—he was subject to the pressure,

[1] De Vogüé, "Affaires de Rome," in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, vol. viii., pp. 817-853, 1887. The study of the eminent writer has since been republished in the recent volume, *Spectacles contemporains*, pp. 1-82. Paris: Armand Colin, 1891.

[2] This opinion was also very clearly expressed by Count Arnim; see Laveleye, *Lettres d'Italie*, p. 221.

and very frequently to the violence of all the larger States. If he refused to further the aims of France or Austria, a French or Austrian army was sent to occupy the Roman States. It sufficed for a man-of-war to appear in the waters of Civitavecchia, or an armed company on the pontifical confines, to force the Pope to act contrary to his own convictions, and, not infrequently, contrary to justice and morality as well.

Subject as it was to the dictates, violence and tyranny of other more powerful States, the Papal policy was always weak and uncertain. But the Pontiff is now more free than he ever has been, and is no longer obliged to limit or adapt his action to necessities of State. Whereas, formerly, a small army or squadron sufficed to oblige him to bow his lofty head and to make the most painful concessions, he is now forced to yield to no one, and can employ a thoroughly free and energetic policy of his own.

When sovereignty was considered as an absolute and divine power, the nations submitted with resignation to the tyranny of the sovereign, who, were he but powerful enough, could easily, as did Henry VIII., compel his subjects by violence and bloodshed to embrace a new religion.

But since they have acquired political freedom, the masses no longer permit the sovereign to employ a religious policy in opposition to their sentiments. And the representative system, which is now adopted by almost all civilised States, has greatly contributed to increase the influence of the Vatican.

There are many nations in Europe which are entirely Catholic, as France, Italy, Austria, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, etc.; others, again, in which the Catholics form a powerful minority, as Great Britain, Germany, Holland, Switzerland, etc. So long as the sovereign was the absolute arbiter of the national policy, he might ignore the minorities completely, and even impose his will on the majorities. In almost all modern European Parliaments in which the Catholics have not the majority, they form, however, an important minority. Now, the very nature of modern Parliaments is such that in the division of parties a compact and well-disciplined minority most frequently becomes the absolute master of the situation.

In the German Reichstag, where the Conservative Right is at continual warfare with the National Liberal party, and the Socialists form a party to themselves, the hundred deputies of the Catholic Centre can turn the balance of the voting at pleasure, and are the true arbiters of the situation.

And in the English Parliament, whereas the strength of Whigs and Tories is about equal, the success of either very often depends on the attitude of the Irish Catholics, who blindly obey the orders of their bishops and the suggestions of the Vatican.

The Vatican is consequently becoming more and more one of the most important centres of European politics, and exercises an ever-increasing action in proportion as its temporal needs diminish.

Notwithstanding its Republican Government, France is disposed, by its Oriental policy and the necessity of internal tranquillity, to make no opposition to the wishes of the Vatican. In Austria, in defiance of every idea of liberty, the Catholics have gone so far as to restore to the schools their denominational character, and to entrust them to the direction of the Catholic clergy. In Spain the power of the bishops is so great that, particularly in the provinces, Protestants dare not even hold public meetings or make the least attempt at proselytism. In Belgium the Pope is more powerful than the King, and exercises his power in the most absolute manner, having at his disposal an ultra-Catholic government and a Parliament composed mostly of Catholics.

In Germany the *Kulturkampf* laws and the prolonged persecution waged against bishops and clergy have served no purpose; the Government was finally obliged to yield to the persistency of the Catholics, and to restore even the religious orders and desist from its war against the clergy. And at the elections in 1880, in order to assure the victory of the Military Septennate, Bismarck was nothing loath to have recourse to the Pope's intervention. He not only abrogated the famous May Laws, but in the affair of the Caroline Islands solicited the Pope's mediation.

The Queen of England, the heir of the of throne Henry

VIII. and Elizabeth, has not only desisted from all policy hostile to the Papacy, but on the celebration of the Jubilee of Leo XIII. sent a special legate to Rome. She even went so far as to promise to found a Catholic University in Dublin, hoping thus to secure the Pontiff's support against the Irish agitation. [1]

It is only in Italy that, owing to the present condition of things, the temporal aspirations of the Papacy, and the uncompromising attitude of the clergy, the Vatican tends more and more to lose ground and to remain a stranger to the national life of the country.

Far from having been weakened, the union of the Catholic Church is every day gaining new strength. The promulgation of the dogma of Papal Infallibility was as the cutting of a gordian knot which had existed for centuries. To the old dissensions between Ultramontanes and Gallicans, Jansenists and Molinists, had succeeded disputes on the relations of the Church and modern society. The Pope is now without any obstacle to his ecclesiastical policy. But Infallibility, which Bossuet held to be a blasphemous heresy, and which was proclaimed in spite of so many difficulties and at such a trying moment, stands more as a sovereign prerogative of which the Pontiff has hardly ever made use, nor probably will make use, unless the better to consolidate the unity of the Church. [2]

In the East, as throughout the Western world, the power and strength of Catholicism are daily increasing. In the United States the Catholics are fast gaining ground, to the detriment of the numerous Protestant communions, and the vast American continent is very largely Catholic. In the East, among the Sclavonic races of Greek rite, a most active propaganda has been on foot for some years, the aim of which is to effect a reunion with the Catholic Church,

[1] E. de Laveleye, who, in the well-known pamphlet, *Le protestantisme et le catholicisme dans leurs rapports avec la liberté et la prosperité des peuples*, Paris, 1875, has shown himself so adverse to Catholicism, confesses that in consequence of the above-mentioned causes the power of the Papacy naturally tends to increase from day to day. Cp. the article already cited on "L'avenir de la Papauté".

[2] Cp. A. Leroy-Beaulieu, *Les catholiques liberaux*, last chapter.

which latter may probably be induced to permit them to retain the orthodox Greek liturgy and to allow their priests to marry.

With the exception of Italy, the power of the Papacy is everywhere increasing, and Catholics are gaining in diffusion and influence throughout the whole world.

Nevertheless, no effort has yet been made to adapt Catholic teachings to the wants and positive tendencies of the age. Even now, as two centuries ago, the Church arrogates to itself the right of interpreting nature, of being still the arbiter of science; even now it demands blind faith superior to reason, and gives its mysteries precedence over facts, and rejecting every criticism of the Holy Scriptures, admits no interpretation but that of the doctors of the Council of Trent. The political doctrines proclaimed in the *Syllabus* show a notable progress, but are none the less contrary to science and reason.[1]

But the Papacy is a much greater and more perfect organism than may appear to superficial observers. If the Church is little disposed to yield in matters of doctrine, on practical ground, on the contrary, it daily seeks to adapt itself more to time and place. Between the Spanish bishops, so wanting in culture and abounding in vain words and menaces, and the intelligent democratic bishops of the United States, who are the faithful interpreters of popular needs, there is fully as great a difference as between a rough, superstitious, country priest and a faithful and learned follower of Luther, who admits free interpretation of Scripture and appeals much more to the reason of his flock than to their ignorance.

The Church must now win the love and attachment of the popular classes. Being no longer in possession of the temporal power, and consequently no longer subject to any of those obstacles which, previous to 1870, rendered its way uncertain and led it into committing great mistakes, it may

[1] Cp. A. Leroy-Beaulieu, work already cited, chap. xi.; J. W. Draper, *The Conflict between Religion and Science*, chap. xii., "The impending crisis". London: King & Co., 1876.

now march forward freely and boldly on a path very different to that trodden during the last centuries.

And while the bourgeoisie is eaten away by scepticism and has no longer faith even in those liberal institutions from which it sprung, while the wealthy and cultured upper classes fall away from religion, the Church feels ever more imperiously the necessity of returning to whence it came—to the people. This movement did not begin in the upper circles, did not originate among the dignitaries of the Vatican, but among the humble clergy who live in contact with the working classes, understanding their needs, interpreting their aspirations, and not infrequently sharing their passions.

Though we deplore the great misery of the people, we know but too well that the results of positive studies show us how difficult it is to remedy it, and that economics and anthropology have passed judgment on the greater part of those socialistic systems which, artificially conceived in the frigid North, have proved, when examined by the vivid light of truth, utterly impotent to save us from the evils. The economist and the statist see clearly the evils that afflict our social organism, but they also know that the revolutionary therapeutic is but a poor vain set of phrases. But the people do not understand our language, and seeing only the apparent causes of the evil that galls them, have no faith in this our solitary science, which offers them no luring words, no seductive promises. A study of the Socialist congresses held within these last years, give us a proof of the injurious evolution accomplished in this sense. In the beginning they tried to conciliate the ideals of the utopists with the results of science, but when they perceived that this hybrid union between beings of different species was impossible, revolutionary Socialism cried out: Science is against us; very well, we shall do without it! The recent Socialist congresses, as also the recent Socialist works, have done nothing but express scorn for bourgeois science and university science, as if science belonged to any one class, or served to keep up a privilege!

Now, on the contrary, the Church addresses the people in a language they understand. When we have demonstrated

that there exist certain natural laws which must not be transgressed, that social economy has certain limits which cannot be passed, and laws that may not be violated, the masses will not understand our language, and will continue either indifferent or hostile to us. We have rashly and inconsiderately sought to destroy all religious belief in the heart of the people. But, as compensation, we have only been able to give them a liberty which has not always been to their advantage.

When the popular masses abandon the faith, they tend fatally to fall into the arms of Democratic Socialism, for Socialism offers them the same spiritual attractions as religious faith.

"Have we not," said Liebknecht, at the Congress of Halle, "have we not that which constitutes the strength of religion, faith in the highest ideals?

"When under the action of Socialist laws we remain for years separated from wife and children, the better to serve our cause, was not ours the religion, not of the Papacy, but of humanity? It was the faith in the triumph of justice, of our ideal; it was the firm conviction that right must needs triumph and injustice succumb. This religion will never fail us, for it is one with Socialism. While I was speaking in Parliament of the general injury done by the law against the Socialists and foretold the fall of its author, the deputy Bamberger said to his neighbour, with a sigh: '*The Socialists have still faith!*' Yes, we still have faith; we know that we shall conquer the world."

When the worker is convinced that beyond this life there are no joys, no recompense for the man who struggles and suffers, he bows unwillingly to the hard consequences of labour, and accepts reluctantly the inevitable sufferings that are inseparable from human toil, but which he considers as the result of social injustice.

Certainly, all that was good and noble in the French Revolution still lives, and has left profound traces in our social life. But the ideals of the Revolution are daily falling off, and the principles diffused by the revolutionary bourgeoisie receive every day a mortal blow.

When we have sought to strip the people of all their religious tendencies, we shall have nothing to substitute for the void we have left in their souls. In the countries in which Socialism is most largely diffused, the clergy have now been attending to the social question for more than twenty years. If the Papacy were to follow the impulse of a great part of its clergy, never halting in the task it has undertaken, if it had the courage to proclaim peace between capital and labour, recognising the rights the latter has in the former, and trying to promote harmony, it would find itself at the head of a movement that no one could check, and which might, perhaps, realise for the Church its old cherished dream of universality.

The Catholic Socialists are not, like those of the school of Lamennais and Lacordaire, mere solitary thinkers. They dispose of many forces, are at the head of a wide agitation, and have based their criticisms and aspirations on a true and profound evil, on a real need. If, unlike the Democratic Socialists, they would reform society in the name of God, they do not for this reason mean to reform it less radically or less profoundly, nor do they on this account exercise a less intense or less irresistible attraction on the labouring classes.

APPENDIX I.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF POPE LEO XIII.

ON THE SOCIAL QUESTION.

(28th December, 1878.)

VENERABILIBUS FRATRIBUS
PATRIARCHIS PRIMATIBUS ARCHIEPISCOPIS
ET EPISCOPIS UNIVERSIS CATHOLICI ORBIS
GRATIAM ET COMMUNIONEM
CUM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTIBUS
LEO PP. XIII.

VENERABILES FRATRES SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM

Quod Apostolici muneris ratio a Nobis postulabat, iam inde a Pontificatus Nostri principio, Litteris encyclicis ad vos datis, Venerabiles Fratres, indicare haud praetermisimus lethiferam pestem, quae per artus intimos humanae societatis serpit, eamque in extremum discrimen adducit: simul etiam remedia efficacissima demonstravimus, quibus ad salutem revocari, et gravissima quae impendent pericula possit evadere. Sed ea quae tunc deploravimus mala usque adeo brevi increverunt, ut rursus ad vos verba convertere cogamur. Propheta velut auribus Nostris insonante: *Clama ne cesses, exalta quasi tuba vocem tuam.*[1] Nullo autem negotio intelligitis, Venerabiles Fratres, Nos de illa hominum secta loqui, qui diversis ac pene barbaris nominibus *Socialistae*, *Communistae*, vel *Nihilistae* appellantur, quique per universum orbem diffusi, et iniquo inter se foedere arctissime colligati, non amplius ab occultorum conventuum tenebris praesidium quaerunt, sed palam fidenterque in lucem prodeuntes, quod iampridem inierunt consilium cuiuslibet civilis societatis fundamenta convellendi, perficere adnituntur. Ii nimirum sunt, qui, prout divina testantur eloquia, *carnem quidem maculant, dominationem spernunt, maiestatem autem blasphemant.*[2] Nihil, quod humanis divinisque legibus ad vitae incolumitatem et decus sapienter decretum est, intactum vel integrum relinquunt. Sublimioribus potestatibus, quibus,

[1] Is., lviii. 1. [2] Iud., Epist v. 8.

Apostolo monente, omnem animam decet esse subiectam, quaeque a Deo ius imperandi mutuantur, obedientiam detrectant, et perfectam omnium hominum in iuribus et officiis praedicant aequalitatem.—Naturalem viri ac mulieris unionem, gentibus vel barbaris sacram, dehonestant; eiusque vinculum, quo domestica societas principaliter continetur, infirmant aut etiam libidini permittunt.—Praesentium tandem bonorum illecti cupiditate, quae *radix est omnium malorum et quam quidam appetentes erraverunt a fide*,[1] ius proprietatis naturali lege sancitum impugnant; et per immane facinus, cum omnium hominum necessitatibus consulere et desideriis satisfacere videantur, quidquid aut legitimae hereditatis titulo, aut ingenii manuumque labore, aut victus parsimonia adquisitum est, rapere et commune habere contendunt. Atque haec quidem opinionum portenta in eorum conventibus publicant, libellis persuadent, ephemeridum nube in vulgus spargunt. Ex quo verenda Regum maiestas et imperium tantam seditiosae plebis subiit invidiam, ut nefarii proditores, omnis freni impatientes, non semel, brevi temporis intervallo, in ipsos regnorum Principes, impio ausu, arma converterint.

Haec autem perfidorum hominum audacia, quae civili consortio graviores in dies ruinas minitatur, et omnium animos sollicita trepidatione percellit, causam et originem ab iis venenatis doctrinis repetit, quae superioribus temporibus tamquam vitiosa semina medios inter populos diffusae, tam pestiferos suo tempore fructus dederunt. Probe enim nostis, Venerabiles Fratres, infensissimum bellum, quod in catholicam fidem inde a saeculo decimo sexto a Novatoribus commotum est, et quam maxime in dies hucusque invaluit, eo tendere ut, omni revelatione submota et quolibet supernaturali ordine subverso, solius rationis inventis, seu potius deliramentis, aditus pateret. Eiusmodi error, qui perperam a ratione sibi nomen usurpat, cum excellendi appetentiam naturaliter homini insertam pelliciat et acuat, omnisque generis cupiditatibus laxet habenas, sponte sua non modo plurimorum hominum mentes, sed civilem etiam societatem latissime pervasit. Hinc nova quadam impietate, ipsis vel ethnicis inaudita, respublicae constitutae sunt, nulla Dei et ordinis ab eo praestituti habita ratione: publicam auctoritatem nec principium, nec maiestatem, nec vim imperandi a Deo sumere dictitatum est, sed potius a populi multitudine; quae ab omni divina sanctione solutam se aestimans, iis solummodo legibus subesse passa est, quas ipsa ad libitum tulisset.—Supernaturalibus fidei veritatibus, tamquam rationi inimicis, impugnatis et reiectis, ipse humani generis Auctor ac Redemptor a studiorum Universitatibus, Lyceis, et Gymnasiis, atque ab omni publica humanae vitae consuetudine sensim et paulatim exulare cogitur.—Futurae tandem aeternaeque vitae praemiis ac poenis oblivioni traditis, felicitatis ardens desiderium intra praesentis temporis spatium definitum est.—Hisce doctrinis longe lateque disseminatis, hac tanta cogitandi agendique licentia ubique parta, mirum non est quod infimae sortis homines, pauperculae domus vel officinae pertaesi, in aedes et fortunas ditiorum involare discupiant; mirum non est quod nulla iam publicae privataeque vitae tranquillitas consistat, et ad extremam perniciem humanum genus iam pene devenerit.

Supremi autem Ecclesiae Pastores, quibus dominici gregis ab hostium insidiis tutandi munus incumbit, mature periculum avertere et fidelium saluti consulere studuerunt. Ut enim primum conflari coeperunt clandestinae societates, quarum sinu errorum, quos memoravimus semina iam tum fovebantur, Romani Pontifices Clemens XII et Benedictus XIV impia sectarum consilia detegere et de pernicie, quae latenter instrueretur, totius orbis fideles admonere non praetermiserunt. Postquam vero ab iis, qui philosophorum nomine gloriabantur, effrenis quaedam libertas homini attributa est, et ius novum, ut aiunt, contra naturalem divinamque legem confingi et sanciri coeptum est, fel. mem. Pius Papa VI statim iniquam earum doctrinarum indolem et falsitatem publicis documentis ostendit; simulque apostolica providentia ruinas praedixit, ad quas plebs misere decepta raperetur.—Sed

[1] I. Tim., vi. 10.

cum nihilominus nulla efficaci ratione cautum fuerit ne prava earum dogmata magis in dies populis persuaderentur, neve in publica regnorum scita evaderent, Pius PP. VII et Leo PP. XII occultas sectas anathemate damnarunt, atque iterum de periculo, quod ab illis impendebat, societatem admonuerunt.— Omnibus denique manifestum est quibus gravissimis verbis et quanta animi firmitate ac constantia gloriosus Decessor Noster Pius IX f. m., sive allocutionibus habitis, sive Litteris encyclicis at totius orbis Episcopos datis, tum contra iniqua sectarum conamina, tum nominatim contra iam ex ipsis erumpentem Socialismi pestem dimicaverit.

Dolendum autem est eos, quibus communis boni cura demandata est, impiorum hominum fraudibus circumventos et minis perterritos in Ecclesiam semper suspicioso vel etiam iniquo animo fuisse, non intelligentes sectarum conatus in irritum cessuros, si catholicae Ecclesiae doctrina, Romanorumque Pontificum auctoritas, et penes principes et penes populos, debito semper in honore mansisset. *Ecclesia* nampue *Dei vivi*, quae *columna* est *et firmamentum veritatis*,[1] eas doctrinas et praecepta tradit, quibus societatis incolumitati et quieti apprime prospicitur, et nefasta Socialismi propago radicitus evellitur.

Quamquam enimvero Socialistae ipso Evangelio abutentes, ad male cautos facilius decipiendos, illud ad suam sententiam detorquere consueverint, tamen tanta est inter eorum prava dogmata et purissimam Christi doctrinam dissensio, ut nulla maior existat: *Quae enim participatio iustitiae cum iniquitate? aut quae societas lucis ad tenebras?*[2] Ii profecto dictitare non desinunt, ut innuimus, omnes homines esse inter se natura aequales, ideoque contendunt nec maiestati honorem ac reverentiam, nec legibus, nisi forte ab ipsis ad placitum sancitis, obedientiam deberi. Contra vero, ex Evangelicis documentis, ea est hominum aequalitas, ut omnes eamdem naturam sortiti, ad eamdem filiorum Dei celsissimam dignitatem vocentur, simulque ut uno eodemque fine omnibus praestituto, singuli secundum eamdem legem iudicandi sint, poenas aut mercedem pro merito consecuturi. Inaequalitas tamen iuris et potestatis ab ipso naturae Auctore dimanat, *ex quo omnis paternitas in caelis et in terra nominatur.*[3] Principum autem et subditorum animi mutuis officiis et iuribus, secundum catholicam doctrinam ac praecepta, ita devinciuntur, ut et imperandi temperetur libido, et obedientiae ratio facilis, firma et nobilissima efficiatur.

Sane Ecclesia subiectae multitudini Apostolicum praeceptum iugiter inculcat: *Non potestas nisi a Deo; quae autem sunt, a Deo ordinata sunt. Itaque qui resistit potestati, Dei ordinationi resistit: qui autem resistunt ipsi sibi damnationem acquirunt.* Atque iterum *necessitate subditos* esse iubet *non solum propter iram, sed etiam propter conscientiam;* et *omnibus debita* reddere, *cui tributum tributum, cui vectigal vectigal, cui timorem timorem, cui honorem honorem.*[4] Siquidem qui creavit et gubernat omnia, provida sua sapientia disposuit, ut infima per media, media per summa ad suos quaeque fines perveniant. Sicut igitur in ipso regno caelesti Angelorum choros voluit esse distinctos aliosque aliis subiectes; sicut etiam in Ecclesia varios instituit ordinum gradus, officiorumque diversitatem, ut non omnes essent Apostoli, non omnes Doctores, non omnes Pastores;[5] ita etiam constituit in civili societate plures esse ordines, dignitate, iuribus, potestate diversos; quo scilicet civitas, quemadmodum Ecclesia, unum esset corpus, multa membra complectens, alia aliis nobiliora, sed cuncta sibi invicem necessaria et de communi bono sollicita.

At vero ut populorum rectores potestate sibi concessa in aedificationem et non in destructionem utantur, Ecclesia Christi opportunissime monet etiam Principibus supremi indicis severitatem imminere; et divinae Sapientiae verba usurpans, Dei nomine omnibus inclamat: *Praebete aures vos qui continetis multitudines et placetis vobis in turbis nationum; quoniam data est a Domino potestas vobis et virtus ab Altissimo, qui interrogabit opera vestra et cogitationes scrutabitur. . . . Quoniam iudicium durissimum his qui praesunt fiet. . . . Non enim subtrahet personam cuiusquam Deus, nec verebitur magnitudinem cuius-*

[1] I. Tim., iii. 15. [2] II. Cor., vi. 14. [3] Ad Eph., iii. 15. [4] Rom. xiii. [5] I. Cor., xii.

quam; quoniam pusillum et magnum ipse fecit, et aequaliter cura est illi de omnibus. Fortioribus autem fortior instat cruciatio.[1] Si tamen quandoque contingat temere et ultra modum publicam a Principibus potestatem exerceri, catholicae Ecclesiae doctrina in eos insurgere proprio marte non sinit, ne ordinis tranquillitas magis magisque turbetur, neve societas maius exinde detrimentum capiat. Cumque res eo devenerit ut nulla alia spes salutis affulgeat, docet christianae patientiae meritis et instantibus ad Deum precibus remedium esse maturandum.—Quod si legislatorum ac principum placita aliquid sanciverint aut iusserint quod divinae aut naturali legi repugnet, christiani nominis dignitas et officium atque Apostolica sententia suadent *obediendum* esse *magis Deo quam hominibus.*[2]

Salutarem porro Ecclesiae virtutem, quae in civilis societatis ordinatissimum regimen et conservationem redundat, ipsa etiam domestica societas, quae omnis civitatis et regni principium est, necessario sentit et experitur, Nostis enim, Venerabiles Fratres, rectam huius societatis rationem, secundum naturalis iuris necessitatem, in indissolubili viri ac mulieris unione primo inniti, et mutuis parentes inter et filios, dominos ac servos officiis iuribusque compleri. Nostis etiam per Socialismi placita eam pene dissolvi; siquidem firmitate amissa, quae ex religioso coniugio in ipsam refunditur, necesse est ipsam patris in prolem potestatem, et prolis erga genitores officia maxime relaxari. Contra vero *honorabile in omnibus connubium,*[3] quod in ipso mundi exordio ad humanam speciem propagandam et conservandam Deus ipse instituit et inseparabile decrevit, firmius etiam et sanctius Ecclesia docet evasisse per Christum, qui Sacramenti ei contulit dignitatem, et suae cum Ecclesia unionis formam voluit referre. Quapropter, Apostolo monente,[4] sicut Christus caput est Ecclesiae, ita vir caput est mulieris; et quemadmodum Ecclesia subiecta est Christo, qui eam castissimo perpetuoque amore complectitur, ita et mulieres viris suis decet esse subiectas, ab ipsis vicissim fideli constantique affectu diligendas.—Similiter patriae atque herilis potestatis ita Ecclesia rationem moderatur, ut ad filios ac famulos in officio continendus valeat, nec tamen praeter modum excrescat. Secundum namque catholica documenta, in parentes et dominos caelestis Patris ac Domini dimanat auctoritas; quae idcirco ab ipso non solum originem ac vim sumit, sed etiam naturam et indolem necesse est mutuetur. Hinc liberos Apostolus hortatur *obedire parentibus suis in Domino, et honorare patrem suum et matrem suam, quod est mandatum primum in promissione.*[5] Parentibus autem mandat: *Et vos, patres, nolite ad iracundiam provocare filios vestros, sed educate illos in disciplina et correptione Domini.*[6] Rursus autem servis ac dominis per eumdem Apostolum divinum praeceptum proponitur, ut illi quidem obediant *dominis carnalibus sicut Christo. . . . cum bona voluntate servientes sicut Domino:* isti autem *remittant minas, scientes quia omnium Dominus est in caelis et personarum acceptio non est apud Deum.*[7]—Quae quidem omnia si secundum divinae voluntatis placitum diligentur a singulis, ad quos pertinet, servarentur, quaelibet profecto familia caelestis domus imaginem quamdam praeseferret, et praeclara exinde beneficia parta, non intra domesticos tantum parietes sese continerent, sed in ipsas respublicas uberrime dimanarent.

Publicae autem ac domesticae tranquillitati catholica sapientia, naturalis divinaeque legis praeceptis suffulta, consultissime providit etiam per ea quae sentit ac docet de iure dominii et partitione bonorum quae ad vitae necessitatem et utilitatem sunt comparata. Cum enim Socialistae ius proprietatis tamquam humanum inventum, naturali hominum aequalitati repugnans traducant, et communionem bonorum affectantes, pauperiem haud aequo animo esse perferendam, et ditiorum possessiones ac iura impune violari posse arbitrentur; Ecclesia multo satius et utilius inaequalitatem inter homines, corporis ingeniique viribus naturaliter diversos, etiam in bonis possidendis agnoscit, et ius proprietatis ac dominii, ab ipsa natura profectum, intactum

[1] Sap., vi. [2] Act., v. 29. [3] Heb., xiii. [4] Ad Eph., v. 5 Ad Eph. vi 1-2. [6] Ibid., v. 4. [7] Ibid., vv. 5, 6, 7.

cuilibet et inviolatum esse iubet: novit enim furtum ac rapinam a Deo, omnis iuris auctore ac vindice ita fuisse prohibita, ut aliena vel concupiscere non liceat, furesque et raptores, non secus ac adulteri et idololatrae, a caelesti regno excludantur.—Nec tamen idcirco pauperum curam negligit, aut ipsorum necessitatibus consulere pia mater praetermittit: quin imo materno illos complectens affectu, et probe noscens eos gerere ipsius Christi personam, qui sibi praestitum beneficiam putat, quod vel in minimum pauperem a quopiam fuerit collatum, magno illos habet in honore: omnia qua potest ope sublevat; domos atque hospitia iis excipiendis, alendis et curandis ubique terrarum curat erigenda, eaque in suam recipit tutelam. Gravissimo divites urget praecepto, ut quod superest pauperibus tribuant; eosque divino terret iudicio, quo, nisi egenorum inopiae succurant, aeternis sint suppliciis mulctandi. Tandem pauperum animos maxime recreat ac solatur, sive exemplum Christi obiiciens, qui *cum esset dives propter nos egenus factus est*;[1] sive eiusdem verba recolens, quibus pauperes beatos edixit et aeternae beatitudinis praemia sperare iussit.—Quis autem non videat optimam hanc esse vetustissimi inter pauperes et divites dissidii componendi rationem? Sicut enim ipsa rerum factorumque evidentia demonstrat, ea ratione reiecta aut posthabita, alterutrum contingat necesse est, ut vel maxima humani generis pars in turpissimam mancipiorum conditionem relabatur, quae diu penes ethnicos obtinuit; aut humana societas continuis sit agitanda motibus, rapinis ac latrociniis funestanda, prout recentibus etiam temporibus contigisse dolemus.

Quae cum ita sint, Venerabiles Fratres, Nos, quibus modo totius Ecclesiae regimen incumbit, sicut a Pontificatus exordiis populis ac Principibus dira tempestate iactatis portum commonstravimus quo se tutissime reciperent: ita nunc extremo, quod instat, periculo commoti Apostolicam vocem ad eos rursus attollimus; eosque per propriam ipsorum ac reipublicae salutem iterum iterumque precamus, obtestantes, ut Ecclesiam, de publica regnorum prosperitate tam egregie meritam, magistram recipiant et audiant; planeque sentiant rationes regni et religionis ita esse coniunctas, ut quantum de hac detrahitur, tantum de subditorum officio et de imperii maiestate decedat. Et cum ad Socialismi pestem avertendam tantam Ecclesiae Christi virtutem noverint inesse, quanta nec humanis legibus inest, nec magistratuum cohibitionibus, nec militum armis, ipsam Ecclesiam in eam tandem conditionem libertatemque restituant, quae saluberrimam vim suam in totius humanae societatis commodum possit exerere.

Vos autem, Venerabiles Fratres, qui ingruentium malorum originem et indolem perspectam habetis, in id toto animi nisu ac contentione incumbite, ut catholica doctrina in omnium animos inseratur atque alte descendat. Satagite ut vel a teneris annis omnes assuescant Deum filiali amore complecti, eiusque numen vereri; Principum legumque maiestati obsequium praestare; a cupiditatibus temperare, et ordinem quem Deus sive in civili sive in domestica societate constituit, diligenter custodire. Insuper adlaboretis oportet ut Ecclesiae catholicae filii neque nomen dare, neque abominatae sectae favere ulla ratione audeant; quin imo, per egregia facinora et honestam in omnibus agendi rationem ostendant, quam bene feliciterque humana consisteret societas, si singula membra recte factis et virtutibus praefulgerent.—Tandem cum Socialismi sectatores et hominum genere potissimum quaerantur qui artes exercent vel operas locant, quique laborum forte pertaesi divitiarum spe ac bonorum promissione facillime alliciuntur, opportunum videtur artificum atque opificum societates fovere, quae sub religionis tutela constitutae omnes socios sua sorte contentos operumque patientes efficiant, et ad quietam ac tranquillam vitam agendam inducant.

Nostris autem vestrisque coeptis, Venerabiles Fratres, Ille aspiret, cui omnis boni principium et exitum acceptum referre cogimur.—Caeterum in spem praesentissimi auxilii ipsa Nos horum dierum erigit ratio, quibus Domini Natalis dies anniversaria celebritate recolitur. Quam enim Christus nascens

[1] II. Cor., viii. 9.

senescenti iam mundo et in malorum extrema pene dilapso novam intulit salutem, eam nos quoque sperare iubet; pacemque, quam tunc per Angelos hominibus nuntiavit, nobis etiam se daturum promisit. Neque enim *abbreviata est manus Domini ut salvare nequeat, neque aggravata est auris ejus ut non exaudiat.*[1] His igitur auspicatissimis diebus Vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, et fidelibus Ecclesiarum vestrarum fausta omnia ac laeta ominantes, bonorum omnium Datorem enixe precamur, ut rursum *hominibus appareat benignitas et humanitas Salvatoris nostri Dei,*[2] qui nos ab infensissimi hostis potestate ereptos in nobilissimam filiorum transtulit dignitatem.—Atque ut citius ac plenius voti compotes simus, fervidas ad Deum preces et ipsi Nobiscum adhibete, Venerabiles Fratres; et B. Virginis Mariae ab origine Immaculatae, eiusque sponsi Iosephi ac beatorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, quorum suffragiis maxime confidimus, patrocinium interponite.—Interim autem divinorum munerum auspicem Apostolicam Benedictionem, intimo cordis affectu, Vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, vestroque Klero ac fidelibus populis universis in Domino impertimur.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die 28 Decembris 1878.

Pontificatus Nostri Anno Primo.

LEO PP. XIII.

[1] Is., lix. 3. [2] Tit., iii 4.

APPENDIX

ADDRESS OF CARDINAL LANGENIEUX AND THE REPLY OF THE SOVEREIGN PONTIFF, ON THE OCCASION OF THE PILGRIMAGE OF FRENCH WORKMEN, ON THE SOCIAL QUESTION.

20th October, 1889.

I.

ADDRESS OF CARDINAL LANGENIEUX, ARCHBISHOP OF RHEIMS.

Très Saint Père,

J'ai l'insigne honneur de présenter à Votre Sainteté le premier groupe du pélerinage des ouvriers français, qui viennent apporter à Vos pieds, avec le témoignage de leur foi et de leur amour, la respectueuse expression de leur reconnaissance et de leur filiale confiance en Votre paternelle et toute puissante protection.

Sachant, parce qu'ils sont chrétiens et que Votre Sainteté a daigné le leur rappeler, que l'Église s'est toujours préoccupée, avec un soin jaloux, des classes ouvrières, qu'elle a ennobli le travail et l'a rendu méritoire devant Dieu,[1] ils ont entendu, avec une grande joie, Votre Béatitude leur dire, il y a deux ans, que cette même Église, dans le passé, alors que sa voix était mieux écoutée et plus obéie, venait en aide aux travailleurs autrement que par les largesses de sa charité, qu'elle avait créé et encouragé ces grandes institutions corporatives, qui ont si puissamment aidé au progrès des arts et des métiers, et procuré aux ouvriers eux-mêmes une plus grande somme d'aisance et de bien-être; que cette sollicitude, elle l'avait inspirée autour d'elle à tous ceux qui jouissaient d'une influence sociale, en sorte qu'elle se manifestait dans les statuts et règlements des cités, dans les ordonnances et les lois des pouvoirs publics.

Ce que l'Église a fait autrefois, Votre Sainteté l'a affirmé, elle veut le faire encore aujourd'hui. Avec quel élan de reconnaissance nos chers ouvriers n'ont-ils pas accueilli Votre parole, Très Saint Père, lorsque Vous ajoutiez: "Nous ne cesserons de faire pour l'amélioration de votre sort tout ce que Notre charge et Notre cœur de Père pourraient Nous suggérer".[2]

Et, en effet, il y a quelques mois à peine, Votre Béatitude daignait louer le projet de pourvoir, par une législation commune aux nations industrielles de l'Europe, à la protection de la classe ouvrière contre les maux, dont elle souffre en ce qui tient le plus au cœur de l'homme chrétien: son foyer.

Merci, Très Saint Père, au nom de la grande famille ouvrière! Ceux qui ont souci du sort des travailleurs vont donc unir leurs efforts, dans le but de

1 *Allocution de Sa Sainteté aux ouvriers français*, 1887.
2 *Ibid.*

mettre l'enfance à l'abri des fatigues prématurées et des périls de l'atelier, de rendre les mères de famille à leur ménage et à leur fonction, de protéger les ouvriers contre un labeur excessif, en empêchant la prolongation du travail journalier au delà des heures équitables, de garantir le repos du Dimanche, espérant combattre ainsi, d'une manière efficace, la peste morale qui se glisse dans les veines de la société humaine.[1]

Oui, Très Saint Père, nous osons le répéter, une peste morale envahit le monde du travail ; elle attaque, à la fois, " la moralité, la justice, la dignité humaine, la vie domestique de l'ouvrier," ces quatre biens que Votre Sainteté a déclaré ne pouvoir jamais être ni menacés ni compromis ;[2]—et chaque jour nous apporte une démonstration plus évidente du jugement, porté autrefois par Votre Béatitude sur les écoles modernes de l'économie sociale, lesquelles, " infectées d'incrédulité, considèrent le travail comme le but suprême de l'homme à l'état de machine plus ou moins précieuse, selon qu'il est apte à plus ou moins de production ".[3]

C'est le résultat logique de l'organisation actuelle de notre société, qui ne repose plus sur les assises de la foi. Et le mal augmente encore par les charges, que font peser sur l'industrie les agissements progressifs de la spéculation usuraire, non moins que l'accroissement constant des impôts, porté forcément à l'excès chez les nations toujours armées les unes contre les autres.

En face de cette situation qu'elles n'ont pas faite, qu'elles sont obligées de subir, que les violences ne feraient qu'aggraver, les classes ouvrières, ne pouvant ni porter efficacement secours à leurs membres, ni être effectivement répresentées dans les conseils de la nation, faute d'associations semblables à celles que Votre Saintetè a si magnifiquement louées, resteraient seules, abandonnées à elles-mêmes, à la fois impuissantes et révoltées, si elles n'avaient recours à l'Église, dont le pouvoir sacré a toujours pesé d'un poids suprême dans la république chrétienne, même de notre temps, puisque, sous le Pontificat de Votre Sainteté, nous en avons eu de si mémorables et si consolants exemples.

Aussi, Très Saint Père, tandis que les uns, sous l'influence des idées égoïstes, qui régissent aujourd'hui le monde, cherchent, dans l'antagonisme entre patrons et ouvriers, le remède aux maux dont ils souffrent, et ne croient pouvoir conquérir une part de leurs droits que par un bouleversement de la société,—tandis que d'autres espèrent encore par des efforts individuels, généreux et persèverants mettre fin au malaise actuel,—les ouvriers qui sont aux pieds de Votre Sainteté et tous ceux qu'ils représentent, se soumettent, en tant que chrétiens, pour obéir à Dieu, aux pénibles conséquences de leur humble situation. Comprenant que leurs souffrances ne tiennent pas principalement au mauvais vouloir des individus, mais aux causes profondes qui ont désorganisé la société, ils repoussent toute suggestion de haine contre les personnes et d'atteinte à la propriété, toute insinuation de révolte contre l'autorité, tout recours aux moyens violents pour améliorer leur sort, mais ils en appellent à la justice des pouvoirs publiques, auxquels il appartient de sauvegarder les intérêts des citoyens et particuliérement des petits et des faibles qui ont les plus besoin de protection ;—et, regardant encore plus loin et plus haut, vers ce sommet lumineux d'où découle toute vérité, d'où est descendue toute civilisation, ils élèvent respectueusement la voix et les mains vers Vous, Très Saint Père, en qui ils vénèrent l'Autorité et la Paternité de Dieu, répétant le cri suppliant des Apôtres au Divin Matrie : *Domini salva nos, perimus.*

Leur confiance ne sera point trompée. Ils savent en qui ils ont cru. C'est en Celui qui a daigné prendre en main les intérêts, non seulement des nations, mais des classes ouvrières, les plus nombreuses victimes de la violation

[1] Conf. *Lettre de S. Exc. Mgr. Jacobini à M. Decurtins*, 1 Mai, 1889.
[2] *Allocution* prima citata.
[3] *Lettre pastorale de Son Em. le cardinal Pecci, Archevêque de Pérouse, sur "La Civilisation et l'Eglise".*

du droit des gens et du militarisme contemporain, lorsqu'il a rappelé aux puissances et aux peuples, dans l'Allocution consistoriale du 11 février dernier, que "l'Église a adouci et humanisé les barbares, en leur communiquant les lois de la justice comme règle des relations mutuelles entre nations, et en faisant une obligation aux petits et aux grands, à ceux qui obéissent comme à ceux qui commandent de ne jamais entrer en lutte pour une cause injuste".

Vos enfants, Très Saint Père, ont à cœur de Vous rendre grâces de ce que Vous avez bien voulu proclamer ces principes tutélaires: et, remplis d'une filiale confiance, ils osent supplier Votre Sainteté de ne point se lasser, malgré les difficultés spéciales à notre temps, de rappeler au monde le respect des lois de la justice et du droit dans les rapports nécessaires des hommes entre eux, afin de garantir à l'ouvrier, dont le travail est la seule resource, la stabilité de son foyer, la facilité de nourrir sa famille, de l'élever chrétiennement et de faire quelque épargne pour les mauvais jours.

Daigne donc Votre Sainteté, Elle—même si éprouvée par l'injustice des hommes, associer l'humble cause de ses enfants à la sienne si auguste, si chère à nos cœurs, et répandre l'abondance des bénédictions célestes sur les ouvriers a nçais, leurs familles, leur travail et leurs œuvres.

II.

REPLY OF THE POPE.

Il y a deux ans, une nombreuse phalange d'ouvriers, venus de France, se groupaient ici autour de Nous. Avec eux, et sous le plus heureux auspices, s'ouvrait alors Notre année Jubilaire, pour laquelle ils nous apportaient comme les prémices des manifestations du monde catholique. Ce jour laissa dans Notre âme une douce et forte impression, que votre présence, chers fils, et les nobles paroles que vient de Nous adresser, en votre nom, Mons. le Cardinal qui préside ce pélerinage, ne peuvent que raviver en Nous et rendre à jamais ineffaçable.—Soyez les bienvenus. L'hommage que vous rendez, en ce moment, au Chef suprême de la religion catholique, révèle le fond de votre pensée. Vous avez compris,—et c'est, à la fois, votre cœur et votre intelligence qui vous l'ont dicté,—vous avez compris, que seulement dans la religion vous trouverez force et consolation, au milieu de vos incessantes fatigues et des misères d'ici-bas. La religion seule, en effet, ouvrira vos âmes aux immortelles espérances; elle seule, ennoblira votre travail, en l'élevant à la hauteur de la dignité et de la liberté humaines. En confiant donc à la religion vos destinées présentes et futures, vous ne pouviez faire acte de plus haute sagesse. Et sur ce point, Nous sommes heureux de confirmer ici les paroles prononcées par Nous en d'autres circonstances, et que vous venez de rappeler. Nous voulons même insister, une fois de plus, sur ces vérités, persuadé, comme Nous le sommes, que pour vous aussi, votre salut sera l'œuvre de l'Église et de ses enseignements remis en honneur dans la société.

Le paganisme, vous ne l'ignorez pas, avait prétendu résoudre le problème social en dépouillant de ses droits la partie faible de l'humanité, en étouffant ses aspirations, en paralysant ses facultés intellectuelles et morales, en la réduisant à l'état d'absolue impuissance. C'était l'esclavage.—Le Christianisme vint annoncer au monde, que la famille humaine tout entière, sans distinction de nobles et des plébéïens, était appelée á entrer en participation de l'héritage divin; il déclara que tous étaient, au même titre, les fils du Père céleste, et rachetés au même prix; il enseigna que le travail était, sur cette terre, la condition naturelle de l'homme, que l'accepter avec courage était, pour lui, un honneur et une preuve de sagesse, que vouloir s'y soustraire, c'était, à la fois, montrer de la lâcheté, en trahir un devoir sacré et fondamental.

Afin de réconforter plus efficacement encore les travailleurs et les pauvres, le divin Fondateur du Christianisme daigna joindre l'exemple aux paroles: Il n'eut pas où reposer sa tête; Il éprouva les rigeurs de la faim et de la soif; Il passa sa vie tant publique que privée dans les fatigues, les angoisses et les

souffrances. D'après sa doctrine, le riche, comme s'exprime Tertullien, a été créé pour être le trésorier de Dieu sur la terre ; à lui les prescriptions sur le bon usage des biens temporels ; contre lui les formidables menaces du Sauveur, s'il vient à fermer son cœur devant l'infortune et la pauvreté !

Cependant, cela même ne suffisait pas encore. Il fallait rapprocher les deux classes, établir entre elles un lien religieux et indissoluble. Ce fut le rôle de la charité : elle créa ce lien social et lui donna une force et une douceur inconnues jusqu'alors ; elle inventa, en se multipliant elle-même, un remède à tous les maux, une consolation à toutes les douleurs ; et elle sut, par ses innombrables œuvres et institutions, susciter, en faveur des malheureux, une noble émulation de zèle, de générosité et d'abnégation.

Telle fut l'unique solution, qui, dans l'inévitable inégalité des conditions humaines, pouvait procurer à chacun une existence supportable. Durant des siècles, cette solution était universellement acceptée et s'imposait à tous. Sans doute, on y a vu se produire des actes de révolte et d'insubordination, mais ils n'ont jamais été que partiels et circonscrits ; la foi avait de trop profondes racines dans les âmes, pour qu'une éclipse générale et définitive fût alors possible. Nul ne se serait permis de contester la légitimité de cette base sociale ; nul n'eût osé former le vaste projet de pervertir, sur ce point, l'esprit et le cœur des populations et de viser à la ruine totale de la société. Quels ont été les doctrines funestes et les événements qui ébranlèrent, plus tard, l'édifice social si patiemment élevé par l'Église, Nous l'avons dit ailleurs ; Nous ne voulons y revenir ici.—Ce que Nous demandons, c'est qu'on cimente à nouveau cet édifice en revenant aux doctrines et à l'esprit du Christianisme ; en faisant revivre, au moins quant à la substance, dans leur vertu bienfaisante et multiple, et sous telles formes que peuvent le permettre les nouvelles conditions des temps, ces corporations d'arts et métiers, qui jadis, informées de la pensée chrétienne, et s'inspirant de la maternelle sollicitude de l'Église, pourvoyaient aux besoins matériels et religieux des ouvriers, leur facilitaient le travail, prenaient soin de leurs épargnes et de leurs économies, défendaient leurs droits et appuyaient, dans la mesure voulue, leurs légitimes revendications.—Ce que Nous demandons, c'est que, par un retour sincère aux principes chrétiens, on rétablisse et l'on consolide entre patrons et ouvriers, entre le capital et le travail, cette harmonie et cette union, qui sont l'unique sauvegarde de leurs intérêts réciproques, et d'où dépendent, à la fois, le bien-être privé, la paix et de la tranquillité publique.

A l'entour de vous, chers fils, s'agitent des milliers d'autres travailleurs, qui, séduits par de fausses doctrines, s'imaginent trouver un remède à leurs maux dans le renversement de ce qui constitue comme l'essence même de la société politique et civile, dans la destruction et l'anéantissement de la propriété. Vaines illusions ! Ils iront se heurter contre des lois immuables que rien ne saurait supprimer. Ils ensanglanteront les chemins où ils passeront, en y amoncelant les ruines et en y semant la discorde et le désordre ; mais ils ne feront, par là, qu'aggraver leurs propres misères et attirer sur eux les malédictions des âmes honnêtes. Non, le remède n'est ni dans les projets et les agissements pervers et subversifs des uns, ni dans les théories séduisantes, mais erronées, des autres ; il est tout entier dans le fidèle accomplissement des devoirs qui incombent à toutes les classes de la société, dans le respect et la sauvegarde des fonctions et des attributions propres à chacune d'elles en particulier. Ces vérités et ces devoirs, l'Église a la mission de les proclamer hautement et des les inculquer à tous.

Aux classes dirigeantes il faut un cœur et des entrailles pour ceux qui gagnent leur pain à la sueur de leur front ; il leur faut mettre un frein à ce désir insatiable des richesses, du luxe et des plaisirs, qui, en bas comme en haut, ne cesse de se propager de plus en plus. A tous les degrés, en effet on a soif de jouissances ; et comme il n'est pas accordé à tous d'y donner satisfaction, il en résulte un malaise immense et des mécontentements, qui auront pour résultat la révolte et l'insurrection en permanence.

Aux détenteurs du pouvoir il incombe, avant toutes choses, de se pénétrer de cette vérité, que pour conjurer le péril qui menace la société, ni les lois humaines, ni la repression des juges, ni les armes des soldats ne sauraient suffire ; ce qui importe par dessus tout, ce qui est indispensable, c'est qu'on laisse à l'Église la liberté de resuciter dans les âmes les préceptes divins, et d'étendre sur toutes les classes de la société sa salutaire influence ; c'est que, moyennant des règlements et des mesures sages et équitables, on garantisse les intérêts des classes laborieuses, on protège le jeune âge, la faiblesse et la mission tout domestique de la femme, le droit et le devoir du repos du Dimanche, et que, par là, on favorise dans les familles comme dans les individus la pureté des mœurs, les habitudes d'une vie ordonnée et chrétienne. Le bien public, non moins que la justice et le droit naturel, réclame qu'il en soit ainsi.

Aux patrons il est prescrit de considérer l'ouvrier comme un frère, d'adoucir son sort dans la limite possible et par des conditions équitables, de veiller sur ses intérêts tant spirituels que corporels, de l'édifier par le bon exemple d'une vie chrétienne, et surtout de ne se départir jamais, à son égard et à son détriment, des règles de l'équité et de la justice, en visant à des profits et à des gains rapides et disproportionnés.

A vous enfin, mes chers fils, et à tous ceux de votre condition, il revient de mener toujours une conduite digne de louange par la pratique fidèle de vos devoirs religieux, domestiques et sociaux. Vous Nous avez déclaré, tout-à-l'heure, et cela Nous a grandement réjoui, vous Nous avez déclaré, que c'est votre volonté formelle de vous soumettre avec résignation au travail et à ses pénibles conséquences, de vous montrer toujours paisibles et respectueux envers vos patrons, dont la mission est de vous procurer de l'ouvrage et de l'organiser, de vous abstenir de tout acte capable de troubler l'ordre et la tranquillité, de conserver, enfin, et de nourrir dans vos cœurs des sentiments de reconnaissance et de confiance filiale envers la sainte Église, qui vous a délivrés de l'antique joug de l'esclavage et de l'oppression, et envers le Vicaire de Jésus-Christ, qui ne cesse et ne cessera jamais de veiller sur vous en Père, de s'enquérer de vos intérêts et de les favoriser, en rappelant à tous leur devoirs respectifs et leur parlant le langage de la charité.

Que ce sentiment de reconnaissance et cette dévotion à l'Église et à son Chef restent en vous inébranlables er s'accroissent de plus en plus.—Notre condition s'aggrave avec les années, et la nécessité, pour Nous, d'une indépendance réelle et d'une vraie liberté dans l'exercice de Notre ministère apostolique, devient de jour en jour plus évidente. En bons catholiques, restez fideles, chers fils, à cette très-noble cause. Faites-la vôtre, et que chacun de vous, dans sa sphère, se fasse un devoir de la défendre et d'en hâter le triomphe.

Et maintenant, chers fils, retournez dans votre patrie, dans cette France, où, malgré des aberrations individuelles et passagères, on n'a jamais vu décroître l'ardeur pour le bien, ni pâlir la flamme de la générosité et du sacrifice. Retournez dans vos foyers, et prouvez, par votre conduite, que dans les associations où les principes religieux sont en honneur, règnent, en même temps, l'amour fraternel, la paix, la discipline, la sobriété, l'esprit de prévoyance et d'économie domestique. Allez, et que la grâce du Seigneur vous accompagne partout, vous assiste, vous protège, vous soutienne dans vos fatigues, vous encourage en vous faisant goûter, dès à présent, les ineffables joies qui découlent de la vertu, et que donne l'espérance d'une vie meilleure dans la patrie des croyants.

C'est le regard et les mains élevés vers le ciel, que Nous y faisons monter, que Nous y ferons monter tous les jours, pour vous, bien-aimés fils, ces vœux, ces supplications et ces prières. En attendant, et comme gage de ces faveurs célestes, Nous vous accordons la Bénédiction Apostolique. Nous vous bénissons tous ici présents, avec toute l'effusion de Notre cœur de Père. Nous bénissons vos fils, et vos familles. Nous bénissons vos chefs, vos patrons et vos bienfaiteurs, ainsi que toutes les pieuses associations dont vous faites partie.

APPENDIX III.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF POPE LEO XIII.

TO OUR VENERABLE BRETHREN,

ALL PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES, ARCHBISHOPS, AND BISHOPS OF THE CATHOLIC WORLD,

IN GRACE AND COMMUNION WITH THE APOSTOLIC SEE,

POPE LEO XIII.

It is not surprising that the spirit of revolutionary change, which has so long been predominant in the nations of the world, should have passed beyond politics and made its influence felt in the cognate field of practical economy. The elements of a conflict are unmistakable: the growth of industry, and the surprising discoveries of science; the changed relations of master and workmen; the enormous fortunes of individuals, and the poverty of the masses; the increased self-reliance and the closer mutual combination of the working population; and, finally, a general moral deterioration. The momentous seriousness of the present state of things just now fills every mind with painful apprehension; wise men discuss it; practical men propose schemes; popular meetings, legislatures, and sovereign princes, all are occupied with it—and there is nothing which has a deeper hold on public attention.

Therefore, venerable brethren, as on former occasions, when it seemed opportune to refute false teaching, we have addressed you in the interests of the Church and of the common weal, and have issued Letters on Political Power, on Human Liberty, on the Christian Constitution of the State, and on similar subjects, so now we have thought it useful to speak on the condition of labour. It is a matter on which we have touched once or twice already. But in this letter the responsibility of the Apostolic office urges us to treat the question expressly and at length, in order that there may be no mistake as to the principles which truth and justice dictate for its settlement. The discussion is not easy, nor is it free from danger. It is not easy to define the relative rights and the mutual duties of the wealthy and of the poor, of capital and of labour. And the danger lies in this, that crafty agitators constantly make use of these disputes to pervert men's judgments and to stir up the people to sedition.

But all agree, and there can be no question whatever, that some remedy must be found, and quickly found, for the misery and wretchedness which press so heavily at this moment on the large majority of the very poor. The ancient workmen's Guilds were destroyed in the last century, and no other organisation took their place. Public institutions and the laws have repudiated the ancient religion. Hence, by degrees, it has come to pass that working-men have been given over, isolated and defenceless, to the callousness of employers and the greed of unrestrained competition. The evil has been increased by rapacious usury, which, although more than once condemned by the Church, is nevertheless, under a different form, but with the same guilt, still practised by avaricious and grasping men. And to this must be added the custom of working by contract, and the concentration of so many branches of trade in the hands of a few individuals, so that a small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the masses of the poor a yoke little better than slavery itself.

To remedy these evils the *Socialists*, working on the poor man's envy of the rich, endeavour to destroy private property, and maintain that individual possessions should become the common property of all, to be administered by the State or by municipal bodies. They hold that, by thus transferring property from private persons to the community, the present evil state of things will be set to rights, because each citizen will then have his equal share of whatever there is to enjoy. But their proposals are so clearly futile for all practical purposes that, if they were carried out, the working-man himself would be among the first to suffer. Moreover, they are emphatically unjust, because they would rob the lawful possessor, bring the State into a sphere that is not its own, and cause complete confusion in the community.

It is surely undeniable that, when a man engages in remunerative labour, the very reason and motive of his work is to obtain property and to hold it as his own private possession. If one man hires out to another his strength or his industry, he does this for the purpose of receiving in return what is necessary for food and living; he thereby expressly proposes to acquire a full and real right, not only to the remuneration, but also to the disposal of that remuneration as he pleases. Thus, if he lives sparingly, saves money, and invests his savings, for greater security, in land, the land, in such a case, is only his wages in another form; and, consequently, a working-man's little estate thus purchased should be as completely at his own disposal as the wages he receives for his labour. But it is precisely in this power of disposal that ownership consists, whether the property be land or movable goods. The *Socialists*, therefore, in endeavouring to transfer the possessions of individuals to the community, strike at the interests of every wage-earner, for they deprive him of the liberty of disposing of his wages, and thus of all hope and possibility of increasing his stock and of bettering his condition in life.

What is of still greater importance, however, is that the remedy they propose is manifestly against justice. For every man has by nature the right to possess property as his own. This is one of the chief points of distinction between man and the animal creation. For the brute has no power of self-direction, but is governed by two chief instincts, which keep his powers alert, move him to use his strength, and determine him to action without the power of choice. These instincts are self-preservation and the propagation of the species. Both can attain their purpose by means of things which are close at hand; beyond their surroundings the brute creation cannot go, for they are moved to action by sensibility alone, and by the things which sense perceives. But with man it is different indeed. He possesses, on the one hand, the full perfection of animal nature, and, therefore, he enjoys, at least as much as the rest of the animal race, the fruition of the things of the body. But animality, however perfect, is far from being the whole of humanity, and is, indeed,

humanity's humble handmaid, made to serve and obey. It is the mind, or the reason, which is the chief thing in us who are human beings; it is this which makes a human being human, and distinguishes him essentially and completely from the brute. And on this account—*viz.*, that man alone among animals possesses reason—it must be within his right to have things not merely for temporary and momentary use, as other living beings have them, but in stable and permanent possession; he must have not only things which perish in the using, but also those which, though used, remain for use in the future.

This becomes still more clearly evident if we consider man's nature a little more deeply. For man, comprehending by the power of his reason things innumerable, and joining the future with the present—being, moreover, the master of his own acts—governs himself by the foresight of his counsel, under the eternal law and the power of God, whose providence governs all things. Wherefore, it is in his power to exercise his choice not only on things which regard his present welfare, but also on those which will be for his advantage in time to come. Hence, man not only can possess the fruits of the earth, but also the earth itself; for, of the products of the earth he can make provision for the future. Man's needs do not die out, but recur; satisfied to-day, they demand new supplies to-morrow. Nature, therefore, owes to man a storehouse that shall never fail, the daily supply of his daily wants. And this he finds only in the inexhaustible fertility of the earth.

Nor must we at this stage have recourse to the State. Man is older than the State; and he holds the right of providing for the life of his body prior to the formation of any State. And to say that God has given the earth to the use and enjoyment of the universal human race is not to deny that there can be private property. For God has granted the earth to mankind in general; not in the sense that all without distinction can deal with it as they please, but rather that no part of it has been assigned to any one in particular, and that the limits of private possession have been left to be fixed by man's own industry and the laws of individual peoples. Moreover, the earth, though divided among private owners, ceases not thereby to minister to the needs of all; for there is no one who does not live on what the land brings forth. Those who do not possess the soil contribute their labour; so that it may be truly said that all human subsistence is derived either from labour on one's own land, or from some laborious industry which is paid for either in the produce of the land itself or in that which is exchanged for what the land brings forth.

Here, again, we have another proof that private ownership is according to Nature's law. For that which is required for the preservation of life, and for life's well-being, is produced in great abundance by the earth, but not until man has brought it into cultivation, and lavished upon it his care and skill. Now, when man thus spends the industry of his mind and the strength of his body in procuring the fruits of Nature, by that act he makes his own that portion of Nature's field which he cultivates—that portion on which he leaves, as it were, the impress of his own personality; and it cannot but be just that he should possess that portion as his own, and should have a right to keep it without molestation.

These arguments are so strong and convincing that it seems surprising that certain obsolete opinions should now be revived in opposition to what is here laid down. We are told that it is right for private persons to have the use of the soil and the fruits of their land, but that it is unjust for any one to possess as owner either the land on which he has built or the estate which he has cultivated. But those who assert this do not perceive that they are robbing man of what his own labour has produced. For the soil which is tilled and cultivated with toil and skill utterly changes its condition; it was wild before, it is now fruitful; it was barren, and now it brings forth in abundance. That which has thus altered and improved it becomes so truly part of itself as to be in great measure indistinguishable and inseparable from it. Is

it just that the fruit of a man's sweat and labour should be enjoyed by another? As effects follow their cause, so it is just and right that the results of labour should belong to him who has laboured.

With reason, therefore, the common opinion of mankind, little affected by the few dissentients who have maintained the opposite view, has found in the study of Nature, and in the law of Nature herself, the foundations of the division of property, and has consecrated by the practice of all ages the principle of private ownership, as being pre-eminently in conformity with human nature, and as conducing in the most unmistakable manner to the peace and tranquillity of human life. The same principle is confirmed and enforced by the civil laws—laws which, as long as they are just, derive their binding force from the law of Nature. The authority of the Divine Law adds its sanction, forbidding us in the gravest terms even to covet that which is another's:—*Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife; nor his house, nor his field, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything which is his* (Deuteronomy v. 21).

The rights here spoken of, belonging to each individual man, are seen in a much stronger light if they are considered in relation to man's social and domestic obligations.

In choosing a state of life, it is indisputable that all are at full liberty either to follow the counsel of Jesus Christ as to virginity, or to enter into the bonds of marriage. No human law can abolish the natural and primitive right of marriage, or in any way limit the chief and principal purpose of marriage, ordained by God's authority from the beginning. *Increase and multiply* (Genesis i. 28). Thus we have the family; the "society" of a man's own household; a society limited indeed in numbers, but a true "society," anterior to every kind of State or nation, with rights and duties of his own, totally independent of the commonwealth.

That right of property, therefore, which has been proved to belong naturally to individual persons, must also belong to a man in his capacity of head of a family; nay, such a person must possess this right so much the more clearly in proportion as his position multiplies his duties. For it is a most sacred law of Nature that a father must provide food and all necessaries for those whom he has begotten; and similarly, Nature dictates that a man's children, who carry on, as it were, and continue his own personality, should be provided by him with all that is needful to enable them honourably to keep themselves from want and misery in the uncertainties of this mortal life. Now, in no other way can a father effect this except by the ownership of profitable property, which he can transmit to his children by inheritance. A family, no less than a State, is, as we have said, a true society, governed by a power within itself—that is to say, by the father. Wherefore, provided the limits be not transgressed which are prescribed by the very purposes for which it exists, the family has at least equal rights with the State in the choice and pursuit of those things which are needful to its preservation and its just liberty.

We say, at least equal rights; for, since the domestic household is anterior both in idea and in fact to the gathering of men into a commonwealth, the former must necessarily have rights and duties which are prior to those of the latter, and which rest more immediately on Nature. If the citizens of a State—that is to say the families—on entering into association and fellowship, experienced at the hands of the State hindrance instead of help, and found their rights attacked instead of being protected, such association were rather to be repudiated than sought after.

The idea, then, that the Civil Government should, at its own discretion, penetrate and pervade the family and the household, is a great and pernicious mistake. True, if a family finds itself in great difficulty, utterly friendless, and without prospect of help, it is right that extreme necessity be met by public aid; for each family is a part of the commonwealth. In like manner,

if within the walls of the household there occur grave disturbance of mutual rights, the public power must interfere to force each party to give the other what is due; for this is not to rob citizens of their rights, but justly and properly to safeguard and strengthen them. But the rulers of the State must go no further: Nature bids them stop here. Paternal authority can neither be abolished by the State, nor absorbed; for it has the same source as human life itself. "The child belongs to the father," and is, as it were, the continuation of the father's personality; and, to speak with strictness, the child takes its place in civil society not in its own rights, but in its quality as a member of the family in which it is begotten. And it is for the very reason that "the child belongs to the father" that, as St. Thomas of Aquin says, "before it attains the use of freewill, it is in the power and care of its parents" (St. Thomas's *Summa Theologica*, 2a 2æ Q. x. Art. 12). The *Socialists*, therefore, in setting aside the parent and introducing the providence of the State, act *against natural justice*, and threaten the very existence of family life.

And such interference is not only unjust, but is quite certain to harass and disturb all classes of citizens, and to subject them to odious and intolerable slavery. It would open the door to envy, to evil speaking, and to quarrelling; the sources of wealth would themselves run dry, for no one would have any interest in exerting his talents or his industry; and that ideal equality of which so much is said would in reality be the levelling down of all to the same condition of misery and dishonour.

Thus it is clear that the main tenet of *Socialism*, the community of goods, must be utterly rejected; for it would injure those whom it is intended to benefit, it would be contrary to the natural rights of mankind, and it would introduce confusion and disorder into the commonwealth. Our first and most fundamental principle, therefore, when we undertake to alleviate the condition of the masses, must be the inviolability of private property. This laid down, we go on to show where we must find the remedy that we seek.

We approach the subject with confidence, and in the exercise of the rights which belong to us. For no practical solution of this question will ever be found without the assistance of Religion and of the Church. It is we who are the chief guardians of Religion and the chief dispenser of what belongs to the Church, and we must not by silence neglect the duty which lies upon us. Doubtless this most serious question demands the attention and the efforts of others besides ourselves—of the rulers of States, of employers of labour, of the wealthy, and of the working population themselves, for whom we plead. But we affirm without hesitation that all the striving of men will be vain if we leave out the Church. It is the Church that proclaims from the Gospel those teachings by which the conflict can be put an end to, or, at the least, made far less bitter; the Church uses its efforts not only to enlighten the mind, but to direct by its precepts the life and conduct of men; the Church improves and ameliorates the condition of the working-man by numerous useful organisations; does its best to enlist the services of all ranks in discussing and endeavouring to meet, in the most practical way, the claims of the working classes; and acts on the decided view that for these purposes recourse should be had, in due measure and degree, to the help of the law and of the State authority.

Let it be laid down, in the first place, that humanity must remain as it is. It is impossible to reduce human society to a level. The *Socialists* may do their utmost, but all striving against Nature is vain. There naturally exist among mankind innumerable differences of the most important kind; people differ in capability, in diligence, in health, and in strength; and unequal fortune is a necessary result of inequality of condition. Such inequality is far from being disadvantageous either to individuals or to the community; social and public life can only go on by the help of various kinds of capacity and the playing of many parts; and each man, as a rule, chooses the part which

peculiarly suits his case. As regards bodily labour, even had man never fallen from *the state of innocence*, he would not have been wholly unoccupied; but that which would then have been his free choice and his delight, became afterwards compulsory, and the painful expiation of sin: *Cursed be the earth in thy work; in thy labour thou shalt eat of it all the days of thy life* (Genesis iii. 17). In like manner the other pains and hardships of life will have no end or cessation on this earth; for the consequences of sin are bitter and hard to bear, and they must be with man as long as life lasts. To suffer and to endure, therefore, is the lot of humanity; let men try as they may, no strength and no artifice will ever succeed in banishing from human life the ills and troubles which beset it. If any there are who pretend differently—who hold out to a hard-pressed people freedom from pain and trouble, undisturbed repose, and constant enjoyment—they cheat the people and impose upon them, and their lying promises will only make the evil worse than before. There is nothing more useful than to look at the world as it really is—and at the same time to look elsewhere for a remedy to its troubles.

The great mistake that is made in the matter now under consideration is to possess oneself of the idea that class is naturally hostile to class; that rich and poor are intended by Nature to live at war with one another. So irrational and so false is this view that the exact contrary is the truth. Just as the symmetry of the human body is the result of the disposition of the members of the body, so in a State it is ordained by Nature that these two classes should exist in harmony and agreement, and should, as it were, fit into one another, so as to maintain the equilibrium of the body politic. Each requires the other; capital cannot do without labour, nor labour without capital. Mutual agreement results in pleasantness and good order; perpetual conflict necessarily produces confusion and outrage. Now, in preventing such strife as this, and in making it possible, the efficacy of Christianity is marvellous and manifold. First of all, there is nothing more powerful than Religion (of which the Church is the interpreter and guardian) in drawing rich and poor together, by reminding each class of its duties to the other, and especially of the duties of justice. Thus Religion teaches the labouring man and the workman to carry out honestly and well all equitable agreements freely made; never to injure capital, or to outrage the person of an employer; never to employ violence in representing his own cause, or to engage in riot or disorder; and to have nothing to do with men of evil principles, who work upon the people with artful promises and raise foolish hopes which usually end in disaster and in repentance when too late. Religion teaches the rich man and the employer that their work people are not their slaves; that they must respect in every man his dignity as a man and as a Christian; that labour is nothing to be ashamed of, if we listen to right reason and to Christian philosophy, but is an honourable employment, enabling a man to sustain his life in an upright and creditable way; and that it is shameful and inhuman to treat men like chattels to make money by, or to look upon them merely as so much muscle or physical power. Thus, again, Religion teaches that, as among the workman's concerns are Religion herself and things spiritual and mental, the employer is bound to see that he has time for the duties of piety; that he be not exposed to corrupting influences and dangerous occasions; and that he be not led away to neglect his home and family or to squander his wages. Then, again, the employer must never tax his work people beyond their strength, nor employ them in work unsuited to their sex or age. His great and principal obligation is to give to every one that which is just. Doubtless, before we can decide whether wages are adequate, many things have to be considered; but rich men and masters should remember this—that to exercise pressure for the sake of gain upon the indigent and the destitute, and to make one's profit out of the need of another, is condemned by all laws, human and divine. To defraud any one of wages that are his due is a crime which cries to the

avenging anger of Heaven: *Behold the hire of the labourers . . . which by fraud hath been kept back by you, crieth, and the cry of them hath entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth* (St. James v. 4). Finally, the rich must religiously refrain from cutting down the workman's earnings, either by force, by fraud, or by usurious dealing; and with the more reason because the poor man is weak and unprotected, and because his slender means should be sacred in proportion to their scantiness.

Were these precepts carefully obeyed and followed, would not strife die out and cease?

But the Church, with Jesus Christ for its Master and Guide, aims higher still. It lays down precepts yet more perfect, and tries to bind class to class in friendliness and good understanding. The things of this earth cannot be understood or valued rightly without taking into consideration the life to come, the life that will last for ever. Exclude the idea of futurity, and the very notion of what is good and right would perish; nay, the whole system of the universe would become a dark and unfathomable mystery. The great truth which we learn from Nature herself is also the grand Christian dogma on which Religion rests as on its base—that when we have done with this present life, then we shall really begin to live. God has not created us for the perishable and transitory things of earth, but for things heavenly and everlasting; He has given us this world as a place of exile and not as our true country. Money, and the other things which men call good and desirable—we may have them in abundance, or we may want them altogether; as far as eternal happiness is concerned, it is no matter; the only thing that is important is to use them aright. Jesus Christ, when He redeemed us with *plentiful redemption*, took not away the pains and sorrows which in such large proportion make up the texture of our mortal life; He transformed them into motives of virtue and occasions of merit; and no man can hope for eternal reward unless he follow in the blood-stained footprints of his Saviour: *If we suffer with Him, we shall also reign with Him* (2 Timothy ii. 12). His labours and His sufferings, accepted by His own freewill, have marvellously sweetened all suffering and all labour. And not only by His example, but by His grace and by the hope of everlasting recompense, He has made pain and grief more easy to bear; *for that which is at present momentary and light of our tribulation worketh for us above measure exceedingly an eternal weight of glory* (2 Corinthians iv. 17).

Therefore those whom fortune favours are warned that freedom from sorrow, and abundance of earthly riches, are no guarantee of the beatitude that shall never end, but rather the contrary (St. Matthew xix. 23 and 24); that the rich should tremble at the threatenings of Jesus Christ—threatenings so strange in the mouth of Our Lord (St. Luke vi. 24, 25); and that a most strict account must be given to the Supreme Judge for all that we possess. The chiefest and most excellent rule for the right use of money is one which the heathen philosophers indicated, but which the Church has traced out clearly, and has not only made known to men's minds, but has impressed upon their lives. It rests on the principle that it is one thing to have a right to the possession of money, and another to have the right to use money as one pleases. Private ownership, as we have seen, is the natural right of man; and to exercise that right, especially as members of society, is not only lawful, but absolutely necessary. *It is lawful*, says St. Thomas of Aquin, *for a man to hold private property; and it is also necessary for the carrying on of human life* (2a 2æ Q. lxvi. Art. 2). But if the question be asked, How must one's possessions be used? the Church replies without hesitation in the words of the same holy Doctor: *Man should not consider his outward possessions as his own, but as common to all, so as to share them without difficulty when others are in need. Whence the Apostle saith, Command the rich of this world . . . to give with ease, to communicate* (*Ibid.*, Q. lxv. Art. 2). True, no one is commanded to distribute to others that which is required for his own necessities and those of

his household; nor even to give away what is reasonably required to keep up becomingly his condition in life; *for no one ought to live unbecomingly* (*Ibid.*, Q. xxxii. Art. 6). But when necessity has been supplied, and one's position fairly considered, it is a duty to give to the indigent out of that which is over: *That which remaineth, give alms* (St. Luke xi. 41). It is a duty, not of justice (except in extreme cases), but of Christian charity—a duty which is not enforced by human law. But the laws and judgments of men must give place to the laws and judgments of Christ, the true God, who in many ways urges on His followers the practice of almsgiving: *It is more blessed to give than to receive* (Acts xx. 35); and who will count a kindness done or refused to the poor as done or refused to Himself—*as long as you did it to one of My least brethren you did it to Me* (St. Matthew xxv. 40). Thus, to sum up what has been said: Whoever has received from the Divine bounty a large share of blessings, whether they be external and corporeal or gifts of the mind, has received them for the purpose of using them for the perfecting of his own nature, and, at the same time, that he may employ them, as the minister of God's Providence, for the benefit of others. *He that hath a talent*, says St. Gregory the Great, *let him see that he hide it not; he that hath abundance let him arouse himself to mercy and generosity; he that hath art and skill, let him do his best to share the use and the utility thereof with his neighbour* (St. Gregory the Great. Hom. ix. *in Evangel.* n. 7).

As for those who do not possess the gifts of fortune, they are taught by the Church that in God's sight poverty is no disgrace, and that there is nothing to be ashamed of in seeking one's bread by labour. This is strengthened by what we see in Christ Himself, who *whereas He was rich, for our sakes became poor* (2 Corinthians viii. 9); and who, being the Son of God and God Himself, chose to seem and be considered the son of a carpenter—nay, did not disdain to spend a great part of His life as a carpenter Himself. *Is not this the carpenter, the Son of Mary?* (St. Mark vi. 3). From the contemplation of this Divine example it is easy to understand that the true dignity and excellence of man lies in his moral qualities—that is, in virtue; that virtue is the common inheritance of all, equally within the reach of high and low, rich and poor; and that virtue, and virtue alone, wherever found, will be followed by the rewards of everlasting happiness. Nay, God Himself seems to incline more to those who suffer evil; for Jesus Christ calls the poor blessed: *Blessed are the poor in spirit* (St. Matthew v. 3): He lovingly invites those in labour and grief to come to Him for solace: *Come to Me all you that labour and are burdened, and I will refresh you* (*Ibid.*, xi., 28): and He displays the tenderest charity to the lowly and the oppressed. These reflections cannot fail to keep down the pride of those who are well off, and to cheer the spirit of the afflicted; to incline the former to generosity and the latter to tranquil resignation. Thus the separation which pride would make tends to disappear, nor will it be difficult to make the rich and poor join hands in friendly concord.

But, if Christian precepts prevail, the two classes will not only be united in the bonds of friendship, but also in those of brotherly love. For they will understand and feel that all men are the children of the common father—that is, of God; that all have the same last end, which is God Himself, who alone can make either men or angels absolutely and perfectly happy; that all and each are redeemed by Jesus Christ and raised to the dignity of children of God, and are thus united in brotherly ties both with each other and with Jesus Christ, *the firstborn among many brethren;* that the blessings of Nature and the gifts of grace belong in common to the whole human race, and that to all, except to those who are unworthy, is promised the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven. *If sons, heirs also; heirs indeed of God and co-heirs of Christ* (Romans viii. 17).

Such is the scheme of duties and of rights which is put forth to the world by the Gospel. Would it not seem that strife must quickly cease were society penetrated with ideas like these?

But the Church, not content with pointing out the remedy, also applies it. For the Church does its utmost to teach and to train men, and to educate them; and by means of its bishops and clergy it diffuses its salutary teachings far and wide. It strives to influence the mind and heart so that all may willingly yield themselves to be formed and guided by the commandments of God. It is precisely in this fundamental and principal matter, on which everything depends, that the Church has a power peculiar to itself. The agencies which it employs are given it for the very purpose of reaching the hearts of men, by Jesus Christ Himself, and derive their efficiency from God. They alone can touch the innermost heart and conscience, and bring men to act from a motive of duty, to resist their passions and appetites, to love God and their fellow-men with a love that is unique and supreme, and courageously to break down every barrier which stands in the way of a virtuous life.

On this subject we need only recall for one moment the examples written down in history. Of these things there cannot be the shadow of doubt; for instance that civil society was renovated in every part by the teachings of Christianity; that in the strength of that renewal the human race was lifted up to better things—nay, that it was brought back from death to life, and to so excellent a life that nothing more perfect had been known before, or will come to pass in the ages that have yet to be. Of this beneficent transformation, Jesus Christ was at once the first cause and the final purpose; as from Him all came, so to Him all was to be referred. For when, by the light of the Gospel message, the human race came to know the grand mystery of the Incarnation of the Word and the redemption of man, the life of Jesus Christ, God and Man, penetrated every race and nation, and impregnated them with His faith, His precepts, and His laws. And if society is to be cured now, in no other way can it be cured but by a return to the Christian life and Christian institutions. When a society is perishing, the true advice to give to those who would restore it is, to recall it to the principles from which it sprung; for the purpose and perfection of an association is to aim at and to attain that for which it was formed; and its operation should be put in motion and inspired by the end and object which originally gave it its being. So that to fall away from its primal constitution is disease; to go back to it is recovery. And this may be asserted with the utmost truth, both of the State in general and of that body of its citizens—by far the greater number—who sustain life by labour.

Neither must it be supposed that the solicitude of the Church is so occupied with the spiritual concerns of its children as to neglect their interests, temporal and earthly. Its desire is that the poor, for example, should rise above poverty and wretchedness, and should better their condition in life; and for this it strives. By the very fact that it calls men to virtue and forms them to its practice, it promotes this in no slight degree. Christian morality, when it is adequately and completely practised, conduces of itself to temporal prosperity, for it merits the blessing of that God who is the source of all blessings; it powerfully restrains the lust of possession and the lust of pleasure—twin plagues, which too often make a man without self-restraint miserable in the midst of abundance: *The root of all evils is cupidity* (1 Timothy vi. 10); it makes men supply by economy the want of means, teaching them to be content with frugal living, and keeping them out of the reach of those vices which eat up not merely small incomes, but large fortunes, and dissipate many a good inheritance.

Moreover, the Church intervenes directly in the interest of the poor by setting on foot and keeping up many things which it sees to be efficacious in the relief of poverty. Here, again, it has always succeeded so well that it has even extorted the praise of its enemies. Such was the ardour of brotherly love among the earliest Christians that numbers of those who were better off deprived themselves of their possessions in order to relieve their brethren; whence *neither was there any one needy among them* (Acts iv. 34). To the order

of Deacons, instituted for that very purpose, was committed by the apostles the charge of the daily distributions; and the Apostle Paul, although burdened with the solicitude of all the churches, hesitated not to undertake laborious journeys in order to carry the alms of the faithful to the poorer Christians. Tertullian calls these contributions, given voluntarily by Christians in their assemblies, *deposits of piety;* because, to cite his words, they were employed *in feeding the needy, in burying them, in the support of boys and girls destitute of means and deprived of their parents, in the care of the aged, and in the relief of the shipwrecked* (Apologia Secunda, xxxix.).

Thus by degrees came into existence the patrimony which the Church has guarded with religious care as the inheritance of the poor. Nay, to spare them the shame of begging, the common Mother of rich and poor has exerted herself to gather together funds for the support of the needy. The Church has stirred up everywhere the heroism of charity, and has established congregations of religious and many other useful institutions for help and mercy, so that there might be hardly any kind of suffering which was not visited and relieved. At the present day there are many who, like the heathen of old, blame and condemn the Church for this beautiful charity. They would substitute in its place a system of State-organised relief. But no human methods will ever supply for the devotion and self-sacrifice of Christian charity. Charity, as a virtue, belongs to the Church; for it is no virtue unless it is drawn from the Sacred Heart of Jesus Christ; and he who turns his back on the Church cannot be near to Christ.

It cannot, however, be doubted that to attain the purpose of which we treat, not only the Church, but all human means must conspire. All who are concerned in the matter must be of one mind and must act together. It is in this as in the Providence which governs the world; results do not happen save where all the causes co-operate.

Let us now, therefore, inquire what part the State should play in the work of remedy and relief.

By the State we here understand, not the particular form of government which prevails in this or that nation, but the State as rightly understood —that is to say, any government conformable in its institutions to right reason and natural law, and to those dictates of the Divine wisdom which we have expounded in the Encyclical on the Christian Constitution of the State. The first duty, therefore, of the rulers of the State should be to make sure that the laws and institutions, the general character and administration of the commonwealth shall be such as to produce of themselves public well-being and private prosperity. This is the proper office of wise statesmanship and the work of the heads of the State. Now, a State chiefly prospers and flourishes by morality, by well-regulated family life, by respect for religion and justice, by the moderation and equal distribution of public burdens, by the progress of the arts and of trade, by the abundant yield of the land—by everything which makes the citizens better and happier. Here, then, it is in the power of a ruler to benefit every order of the State, and, amongst the rest, to promote in the highest degree the interests of the poor; and this by virtue of his office, and without being exposed to any suspicion of undue interference —for it is the province of the commonwealth to consult for the common good. And the more that is done for the working population by the general laws of the country, the less need will there be to seek for particular means to relieve them.

There is another and a deeper consideration which must not be lost sight of. To the State the interests of all are equal, whether high or low. The poor are members of the national community equally with the rich; they are real component parts, living parts, which make up, through the family, the living body; and it need hardly be said that they are by far the majority. It would be irrational to neglect one portion of the citizens and to favour

another; and, therefore, the public administration must duly and solicitously provide for the welfare and the comfort of the working people, or else that law of justice will be violated which ordains that each shall have his due. To cite the wise words of St. Thomas of Aquin: *As the part and the whole are in a certain sense identical, the part may in some sense claim what belongs to the whole* (2a 2æ Q. lxi. Art. 1 ad 2). Among the many and grave duties of rulers, who would do their best for the people, the first and chief is to act with strict justice—with that justice which is called in the schools *distributive*—towards each and every class.

But although all citizens, without exception, can and ought to contribute to that common good in which individuals share so profitably to themselves, yet it is not to be supposed that all can contribute in the same way and to the same extent. No matter what changes may be made in forms of government, there will always be differences and inequalities of condition in the State; society cannot exist or be conceived without them. Some there must be who dedicate themselves to the work of the commonwealth, who make the laws, who administer justice, whose advice and authority govern the nation in times of peace, and defend it in war. Such men clearly occupy the foremost place in the State, and should be held in the foremost estimation, for their work touches most nearly and effectively the general interests of the community. Those who labour at a trade or calling do not promote the general welfare in such a fashion as this; but they do, in the most important way, benefit the nation, though less directly. We have insisted, that since it is the end of society to make men better, the chief good that society can be possessed of is virtue. Nevertheless, in all well-constituted States, it is by no means an unimportant matter to provide those bodily and external commodities, *the use of which is necessary to virtuous action* (St. Thomas of Aquin. *De Regimine Principum*, I. cap. 15). And in the provision of material well-being, the labour of the poor—the exercise of their skill and the employment of their strength in the culture of the land and the workshops of trade—is most efficacious and altogether indispensable. Indeed, their co-operation in this respect is so important that, it may be truly said, it is only by the labour of the working-man that States grow rich. Justice, therefore, demands that the interests of the poorer population be carefully watched over by the Administration, so that they who contribute so largely to the advantage of the community may themselves share in the benefits they create—that being housed, clothed, and enabled to support life, they may find their existence less hard and more endurable. It follows that whatever shall appear to be conducive to the well-being of those who work, should receive favourable consideration. Let it not be feared that solicitude of this kind will injure any interest; on the contrary, it will be to the advantage of all; for it cannot but be good for the commonwealth to secure from misery those on whom it so largely depends.

We have said that the State must not absorb the individual or the family; both should be allowed free and untrammelled action as far as is consistent with the common good and the interests of others. Nevertheless, rulers should anxiously safeguard the community and all its parts; the community, because the conservation of the community is so emphatically the business of the supreme power, that the safety of the commonwealth is not only the first law, but it is a Government's whole reason of existence; and the parts, because both philosophy and the Gospel agree in laying down that the object of the administration of the State should be, not the advantage of the ruler, but the benefit of those over whom he rules. The gift of authority is from God, and is, as it were, a participation of the highest of all sovereignties; and it should be exercised as the power of God is exercised—with a fatherly solicitude which not only guides the whole, but reaches to details as well.

Whenever the general interest or any particular class suffers, or is threatened with evils which can in no other way be met, the public authority must step in to meet them. Now, among the interests of the public, as of

private individuals, are these: that peace and good order should be maintained; that family life should be carried on in accordance with God's laws and those of nature; that religion should be reverenced and obeyed; that a high standard of morality should prevail in public and private life; that the sanctity of justice should be respected, and that no one should injure another with impunity; that the members of the commonwealth should grow up to man's estate strong and robust, and capable, if need be, of guarding and defending their country. If by a strike or other combination of workmen, there should be imminent danger of disturbance to the public peace; or if circumstances were such that among the labouring population the ties of family life were relaxed; if religion were found to suffer through the workmen not having time and opportunity to practise it; if in workshops and factories there were danger to morals through the mixing of the sexes, or from any occasion of evil; or if employers laid burdens upon the workmen which were unjust, or degraded them with conditions that were repugnant to their dignity as human beings; finally, if health were endangered by excessive labour, or by work unsuited to sex or age—in these cases there can be no question that, within certain limits, it would be right to call in the help and authority of the law. The limits must be determined by the nature of the occasion which calls for the law's interference—the principle being this, that the law must not undertake more, or go further, than is required for the remedy of the evil or the removal of the danger.

Rights must be religiously respected wherever they are found; and it is the duty of the public authority to prevent and punish injury, and to protect each one in the possession of his own. Still, when there is question of protecting the rights of individuals, the poor and helpless have a claim to special consideration. The richer population have many ways of protecting themselves, and stand less in need of help from the State; those who are badly off have no resources of their own to fall back upon, and must chiefly rely upon the assistance of the State. And it is for this reason that wage-earners, who are undoubtedly among the weak and necessitous, should be specially cared for and protected by the commonwealth.

Here, however, it will be advisable to advert expressly to one or two of the more important details. It must be borne in mind that the chief thing to be secured is the safe-guarding, by legal enactment and policy, of private property. Most of all is it essential in these times of covetous greed to keep the multitude within the line of duty; for if all may justly strive to better their condition, yet neither justice nor the common good allows any one to seize that which belongs to another, or, under the pretext of futile and ridiculous equality, to lay hands on other people's fortunes. It is most true that by far the larger part of the people who work prefer to improve themselves by honest labour, rather than by doing wrong to others. But there are not a few who are imbued with bad principles and are anxious for revolutionary change, and whose great purpose it is to stir up tumult and bring about a policy of violence. The authority of the State should intervene to put restraint upon these disturbers, to save the workmen from their seditious arts, and to protect lawful owners from spoliation.

When work people have recourse to a strike, it is frequently because the hours of labour are too long, or the work too hard, or because they consider their wages insufficient. The grave inconvenience of this not uncommon occurrence should be obviated by public remedial measures; for such paralysis of labour not only affects the masters and their work people, but is extremely injurious to trade and to the general interests of the public; moreover, on such occasions, violence and disorder are generally not far off, and thus it frequently happens that the public peace is threatened. The laws should be beforehand, and prevent these troubles from arising; they should lend their influence and authority to the removal in good time of the causes which lead to conflicts between masters and those whom they employ.

But if the owners of property must be made secure, the workman, too, has property and possessions in which he must be protected; and, first of all, there are his spiritual and mental interests. Life on earth, however good and desirable in itself, is not the final purpose for which man is created; it is only the way and the means to that attainment of truth and that practice of goodness in which the full life of the soul consists. It is the soul which is made after the image and likeness of God; it is in the soul that sovereignty resides, in virtue of which man is commanded to rule the creatures below him, and to use all the earth and the ocean for his profit and advantage. *Fill the earth and subdue it; and rule over the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the air, and all living creatures which move upon the earth* (Genesis i. 28). In this respect all men are equal; there is no difference between rich and poor, master and servant, ruler and ruled, *for the same is Lord over all* (Romans x. 12). No man may outrage with impunity that human dignity which God Himself treats *with reverence*, nor stand in the way of that higher life which is the preparation for the eternal life of heaven. Nay, more; a man has here no power over himself. To consent to any treatment which is calculated to defeat the end and purpose of his being is beyond his right; he cannot give up his soul to servitude; for it is not man's own rights which are here in question, but the rights of God, most sacred and inviolable.

From this follows the obligation of the cessation of work and labour on Sundays and certain festivals. This rest from labour is not to be understood as mere idleness; much less must it be an occasion of spending money, and of vicious excess, as many would desire it to be; but it should be rest from labour consecrated by religion. Repose, united with religious observance, disposes man to forget for a while the business of this daily life, and to turn his thoughts to heavenly things, and to the worship which he so strictly owes to the Eternal Deity. It is this, above all, which is the reason and motive of the Sunday rest; a rest sanctioned by God's great law of the ancient covenant, *Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath Day* (Exod. xx. 8), and taught to the world by His own mysterious "rest" after the creation of man: *He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had done* (Genesis ii. 2).

If we turn now to things exterior and corporeal, the first concern of all is to save the poor workers from the cruelty of grasping speculators, who use human beings as mere instruments for making money. It is neither justice nor humanity so to grind men down with excessive labour, as to stupefy their minds and wear out their bodies. Man's powers, like his general nature, are limited, and beyond these limits he cannot go. His strength is developed and increased by use and exercise, but only on condition of due intermission and proper rest. Daily labour, therefore, must be so regulated that it may not be protracted during longer hours than strength admits. How many and how long the intervals of rest should be will depend on the nature of the work, on circumstances of time and place, and on the health and strength of the workman. Those who labour in mines and quarries, and in work within the bowels of the earth, should have shorter hours in proportion as their labour is more severe and more trying to health. Then, again, the season of the year must be taken into account; for not unfrequently a kind of labour is easy at one time which at another is intolerable, or very difficult. Finally, work which is suitable for a strong man cannot reasonably be required from a woman or a child. And, in regard to children, great care should be taken not to place them in workshops and factories until their bodies and minds are sufficiently mature. For just as rough weather destroys the buds of spring, so too early an experience of life's hard work blights the young promise of a child's powers, and makes any real education impossible. Women, again, are not suited to certain trades; for a woman is by nature fitted for home work, and it is that which is best adapted at once to preserve her modesty and to promote the good bringing-up of children and the well-being of the family. As a general principle, it may be laid down that a workman ought to have

leisure and rest in proportion to the wear and tear of his strength; for the waste of strength must be repaired by the cessation of work.

In all agreements between masters and work people there is always the condition expressed or understood, that there be allowed proper rest for soul and body. To agree in any other sense would be against what is right and just; for it can never be right or just to require on the one side, or to promise on the other, the giving up of those duties which a man owes to his God and to himself.

We now approach a subject of very great importance, and one on which, if extremes are to be avoided, right ideas are absolutely necessary. Wages, we are told, are fixed by free consent; and, therefore, the employer, when he pays what was agreed upon, has done his part and is not called upon for anything further. The only way, it is said, in which injustice could happen would be if the master refused to pay the whole of the wages, or the workman would not complete the work undertaken; when this happens the State should intervene to see that each obtains his own—but not under any other circumstances.

This mode of reasoning is by no means convincing to a fair-minded man, for there are important considerations which it leaves out of view altogether. To labour is to exert oneself for the sake of procuring what is necessary for the purposes of life, and most of all for self-preservation. *In the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat bread* (Genesis iii. 19). Therefore a man's labour has two notes or characters. First of all, it is *personal;* for the exertion of individual power belongs to the individual who puts it forth, employing this power for that personal profit for which it was given. Secondly, man's labour is *necessary;* for without the result of labour a man cannot live; and self-conservation is a law of Nature which it is wrong to disobey. Now, if we were to consider labour merely so far as it is *personal*, doubtless it would be within the workman's right to accept any rate of wages whatever; for in the same way as he is free to work or not, so he is free to accept a small remuneration, or even none at all. But this is a mere abstract supposition; the labour of the working man is not only his personal attribute, but it is *necessary;* and this makes all the difference. The preservation of life is the bounden duty of each and all, and to fail therein is a crime. It follows that each one has a right to procure what is required in order to live; and the poor can procure it in no other way than by work and wages.

Let it be granted then, that, as a rule, workman and employer should make free agreements, and in particular should freely agree as to wages; nevertheless, there is a dictate of Nature more imperious and more ancient than any bargain between man and man, that the remuneration must be enough to support the wage-earner in reasonable and frugal comfort. If, through necessity or fear of a worse evil, the workman accepts harder conditions because an employer or a contractor will give him no better, he is the victim of force and injustice. In these and similar questions, however—such as, for example, the hours of labour in different trades, the sanitary precautions to be observed in factories and workshops, etc.—in order to supersede undue interference on the part of the State, especially as circumstances, times and localities differ so widely, it is advisable that recourse be had to societies or boards, such as we shall mention presently, or to some other method of safe-guarding the interests of the wage-earners; the State to be asked for approval and protection.

If a workman's wages be sufficient to enable him to maintain himself, his wife and his children in reasonable comfort, he will not find it difficult, if he is a sensible man, to study economy; and he will not fail, by cutting down expenses, to put by a little property; nature and reason would urge him to do this. We have seen that this great labour question cannot be solved except by assuming as a principle that private ownership must be held sacred and inviolable. The law, therefore, should favour ownership, and its policy should be to induce as many of the people as possible to become owners.

Many excellent results will follow from this; and, first of all, property will certainly become more equitably divided. For the effect of civil change and revolution has been to divide society into two widely different castes. On the one side there is the party which holds the power because it holds the wealth; which has in its grasp all labour and all trade, which manipulates for its own benefit and its own purposes all the sources of supply, and which is powerfully represented in the councils of the State itself. On the other side there is the needy and powerless multitude, sore and suffering, and always ready for disturbance. If working people can be encouraged to look forward to obtaining a share in the land, the result will be that the gulf between vast wealth and deep poverty will be bridged over, and the two orders will be brought nearer together. Another consequence will be the greater abundance of the fruits of the earth. Men always work harder and more readily when they work on that which is their own; nay, they learn to love the very soil which yields in response to the labour of their hands, not only food to eat, but an abundance of good things for themselves and those that are dear to them. It is evident how such a spirit of willing labour would add to the produce of the earth and to the wealth of the community. And a third advantage would arise from this: men would cling to the country in which they were born; for no one would exchange his country for a foreign land if his own afforded him the means of living a tolerable and happy life. These three important benefits, however, can only be expected on the condition that a man's means be not drained and exhausted by excessive taxation. The right to possess private property is from Nature, not from man; and the State has only the right to regulate its use in the interests of the public good, but by no means to abolish it altogether. The State is, therefore, unjust and cruel if, in the name of taxation, it deprives the private owner of more than is just.

In the last place—employers and workmen may themselves effect much in the matter of which we treat, by means of those institutions and organisations which afford opportune assistance to those in need, and which draw the two orders more closely together. Among these may be enumerated: societies for mutual help; various foundations established by private persons for providing for the workman, and for the widow or his orphans, in sudden calamity, in sickness, and in the event of death; and what are called "patronages," or institutions for the care of boys and girls, for young people, and also for those of more mature age.

The most important of all are workmen's associations; for these virtually include all the rest. History attests what excellent results were effected by the Artificers' Guilds of a former day. They were the means not only of many advantages to the workmen, but in no small degree of the advancement of art, as numerous monuments remain to prove. Such associations should be adapted to the requirements of the age in which we live—an age of greater instruction, of different customs, and of more numerous requirements in daily life. It is gratifying to know that there are actually in existence not a few societies of this nature, consisting either of workmen alone, or of workmen and employers together; but it were greatly to be desired that they should multiply and become more effective. We have spoken of them more than once; but it will be well to explain here how much they are needed, to show that they exist by their own right, and to enter into their organisation and their work.

The experience of his own weakness urges man to call in help from without. We read in the pages of Holy Writ: *It is better that two should be together than one; for they have the advantage of their society. If one fall he shall be supported by the other. Woe to him that is alone, for when he falleth he hath none to lift him up* (Ecclesiastes iv. 9, 10). And, further: *A brother that is helped by his brother is like a strong city* (Proverbs xviii. 19). It is this natural impulse which unites men in civil society; and it is this also which makes them band themselves together in associations of citizen with citizen; associa-

tions which, it is true, cannot be called societies in the complete sense of the word, but which are societies nevertheless.

These lesser societies, and the society which constitutes the State, differ in many things, because their immediate purpose and end is different. Civil society exists for the common good, and, therefore, is concerned with the interests of all in general, and with individual interests in their due place and proportion. Hence it is called *public* society, because by its means, as St. Thomas of Aquin says, *Men communicate with one another in the setting up of a commonwealth* (*contra impugnantes Dei cultum et religionem*, Cap. II.). But the societies which are formed in the bosom of the State are called *private*, and justly so, because their immediate purpose is the private advantage of the associates. *Now a private society*, says St. Thomas again, *is one which is formed for the purpose of carrying out private business; as when two or three enter into a partnership with the view of trading in conjunction* (*ibid.*). Particular societies, then, although they exist within the State, and are each a part of the State, nevertheless cannot be prohibited by the State absolutely and as such. For to enter into "society" of this kind is the natural right of man; and the State must protect natural rights, not destroy them; and if it forbids its citizens to form associations, it contradicts the very principle of its own existence; for both they and it exist in virtue of the same principle—*viz.*, the natural propensity of man to live in society.

There are times, no doubt, when it is right that the law should interfere to prevent association; as when men join together for purposes which are evidently bad, unjust, or dangerous to the State. In such cases the public authority may justly forbid the formation of associations, and may dissolve them when they already exist. But every precaution should be taken not to violate the rights of individuals, and not to make unreasonable regulations under the pretence of public benefit. For laws only bind when they are in accordance with right reason, and, therefore, with the eternal law of God. (*Human law is law only in virtue of its accordance with right reason: and thus it is manifest that it flows from the eternal law. And in so far as it deviates from right reason it is called an unjust law; in such case it is not law at all, but rather a species of violence.*—St. Thomas of Aquin, *Summa Theologica*, 1a 2æ Q. xciii. Art. iii.)

And here we are reminded of the confraternities, societies, and religious orders, which have arisen by the Church's authority and the piety of the Christian people. The annals of every nation, down to our own times, testify to what they have done for the human race. It is indisputable, on grounds of reason alone, that such associations, being perfectly blameless in their objects, have the sanction of the law of Nature. On their religious side they rightly claim to be responsible to the Church alone. The administrators of the State, therefore, have no rights over them, nor can they claim any share in their management; on the contrary, it is the State's duty to respect and cherish them, and, if necessary, to defend them from attack. It is notorious that a very different course has been followed, more especially in our own times. In many places the State has laid violent hands on these communities, and committed manifold injustice against them; it has placed them under the civil law, taken away their rights as corporate bodies, and robbed them of their property. In such property the Church had her rights, each member of the body had his or her rights, and there were also the rights of those who had founded or endowed them for a definite purpose, and of those for whose benefit and assistance they existed. Wherefore, we cannot refrain from complaining of such spoliation as unjust and fraught with evil results; and with the more reason because, at the very time when the law proclaims that association is free to all, we see that Catholic societies, however peaceable and useful, are hindered in every way, whilst the utmost freedom is given to men whose objects are at once hurtful to religion and dangerous to the State.

Associations of every kind, and especially those of working men, are now

far more common than formerly. In regard to many of these, there is no need at present to inquire whence they spring, what are their objects, or what means they use. But there is a good deal of evidence which goes to prove that many of these societies are in the hands of invisible leaders, and are managed on principles far from compatible with Christianity and the public well-being; and that they do their best to get into their hands the whole field of labour, and to force workmen either to join them or to starve. Under these circumstances Christian workmen must do one of two things; either join associations in which their religion will be exposed to peril, or form associations among themselves—unite their forces and courageously shake off the yoke of an unjust and intolerable oppression. No one who does not wish to expose man's chief good to extreme danger will hesitate to say that the second alternative must by all means be adopted.

Those Catholics are worthy of all praise—and there are not a few—who, understanding what the times require, have, by various enterprises and experiments, endeavoured to better the condition of the working people without any sacrifice of principle. They have taken up the cause of the working man, and have striven to make both families and individuals better off; to infuse the spirit of justice into the mutual relations of employer and employed; to keep before the eyes of both classes the precepts of duty and the laws of the Gospel —that Gospel which, by inculcating self-restraint, keeps men within the bounds of moderation, and tends to establish harmony among the divergent interests and various classes which compose the State. It is with such ends in view that we see men of eminence meeting together for discussion, for the promotion of united action, and for practical work. Others, again, strive to unite working people of various kinds into associations, help them with their advice and their means, and enable them to obtain honest and profitable work. The bishops, on their part, bestow their ready good-will and support; and with their approval and guidance many members of the clergy, both secular and regular, labour assiduously on behalf of the spiritual and mental interests of the members of associations. And there are not wanting Catholics possessed of affluence, who have, as it were, cast in their lot with the wage-earners, and who have spent large sums in founding and widely spreading benefit and insurance societies, by means of which the working man may, without difficulty, acquire by his labour, not only many present advantages, but also the certainty of honourable support in time to come. How much this multiplied and earnest activity has benefited the community at large is too well known to require us to dwell upon it. We find in it the grounds of the most cheering hope for the future, provided that the associations we have described continue to grow and spread, and are well and wisely administered. Let the State watch over these societies of citizens united together in the exercise of their right; but let it not thrust itself into their peculiar concerns and their organisation; for things move and live by the soul within them, and they may be killed by the grasp of a hand from without.

In order that an association may be carried on with unity of purpose and harmony of action, its organisation and government must be firm and wise. All such societies, being free to exist, have the further right to adopt such rules and organisation as may best conduce to the attainment of their objects. We do not deem it possible to enter into definite details on the subject of organisation; this must depend on national character, on practice and experience, on the nature and scope of the work to be done, on the magnitude of the various trades and employments, and on other circumstances of fact and of time—all of which must be carefully weighed.

Speaking summarily, we may lay it down as a general and perpetual law that workmen's associations should be so organised and governed as to furnish the best and most suitable means for attaining what is aimed at—that is to say, for helping each individual member to better his condition to the utmost in body, mind, and property. It is clear that they must pay special and principal attention to piety and morality, and that their internal discipline

must be directed precisely by these considerations; otherwise, they entirely lose their special character, and come to be very little better than those societies which take no account of religion at all. What advantage can it be to a workman to obtain, by means of a society, all that he requires, and to endanger his soul for want of spiritual food? *What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his own soul?* (St. Matthew xvi. 26). This, as our Lord teaches, is the note or character that distinguishes the Christian from the heathen. *After all these things do the heathen seek. . . . Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His justice, and all these things shall be added unto you* (St. Matthew vi. 32, 33). Let our associations, then, look first and before all to God; let religious instruction have therein a foremost place, each one being carefully taught what is his duty to God, what to believe, what to hope for, and how to work out his salvation; and let all be warned and fortified with especial solicitude against wrong opinions and false teaching. Let the working man be urged and led to the worship of God, to the earnest practice of religion, and among other things to the sanctification of Sundays and festivals. Let him learn to reverence and love Holy Church, the common Mother of us all; and so to obey the precepts, and to frequent the Sacraments of the Church, those Sacraments being the means ordained by God for obtaining forgiveness of sin and for leading a holy life.

The foundations of the organisation being laid in religion, we next go on to determine the relations of the members one to another, in order that they may live together in concord and go on prosperously and successfully. The offices and charges of the society should be distributed for the good of the society itself, and in such manner that difference in degree or position should not interfere with unanimity and good-will. Office-bearers should be appointed with prudence and discretion, and each one's charge should be carefully marked out; thus no member will suffer wrong. Let the common funds be administered with the strictest honesty in such way that a member receive assistance in proportion to his necessities. The rights and duties of employers should be the subject of careful consideration as compared with the rights and duties of the employed. If it should happen that either a master or a workman deemed himself injured, nothing would be more desirable than that there should be a committee composed of honest and capable men of the association itself, whose duty it should be, by the laws of the association, to decide the dispute. Among the purposes of a society should be to try to arrange for a continuous supply of work at all times and seasons; and to create a fund from which the members may be helped in their necessities, not only in cases of accident, but also in sickness, old age, and misfortune.

Such rules and regulations, if obeyed willingly by all, will sufficiently ensure the well-being of poor people; whilst such mutual associations among Catholics are certain to be productive, in no small degree, of prosperity to the State. It is not rash to conjecture the future from the past. Age gives way to age, but the events of one century are wonderfully like those of another: for they are directed by the Providence of God, who over-rules the course of history in accordance with His purposes in creating the race of man. We are told that it was cast as a reproach on the Christians of the early ages of the Church that the greater number of them had to live by begging or by labour. Yet, destitute as they were of wealth and influence, they ended by winning over to their side the favour of the rich and the goodwill of the powerful. They showed themselves industrious, laborious, and peaceful, men of justice, and, above all, men of brotherly love. In the presence of such a life and such an example, prejudice disappeared, the tongue of malevolence was silenced, and the lying traditions of ancient superstition yielded little by little to Christian truth.

At this moment the condition of the working population is the question of the hour; and nothing can be of higher interest to all classes of the State than that it should be rightly and reasonably decided. But it will be easy for Christian working men to decide it aright if they form associations, choose

wise guides, and follow the same path which, with so much advantage to themselves and the commonwealth, was trod by their fathers before them. Prejudice, it is true, is mighty, and so is the love of money; but if the sense of what is just and right be not destroyed by depravity of heart, their fellow-citizens are sure to be won over to a kindly feeling towards men whom they see to be so industrious and so modest, who so unmistakably prefer honesty to lucre, and the sacredness of duty to all other considerations.

And another great advantage would result from the state of things we are describing; there would be so much more hope and possibility of recalling to a sense of their duty those working men who have either given up their faith altogether, or whose lives are at variance with its precepts. These men, in most cases, feel that they have been fooled by empty promises and deceived by false appearances. They cannot but perceive that their grasping employers too often treat them with the greatest inhumanity, and hardly care for them beyond the profit their labour brings; and, if they belong to an association, it is probably one in which there exists, in place of charity and love, that intestine strife which always accompanies unresigned and irreligious poverty. Broken in spirit and worn down in body, how many of them would gladly free themselves from this galling slavery! But human respect, or the dread of starvation, makes them afraid to take the step. To such as these Catholic associations are of incalculable service, helping them out of their difficulties, inviting them to companionship, and receiving the repentant to a shelter in which they may securely trust.

We have now laid before you, venerable brethren, who are the persons, and what are the means, by which this most difficult question must be solved. Every one must put his hand to the work which falls to his share, and that at once and immediately, lest the evil which is already so great may by delay become absolutely beyond remedy. Those who rule the State must use the law and the institutions of the country; masters and rich men must remember their duty; the poor, whose interests are at stake, must make every lawful and proper effort; and since religion alone, as we said at the beginning, can destroy the evil at its root, all men must be persuaded that the primary thing needful is to return to real Christianity, in the absence of which all the plans and devices of the wisest will be of little avail.

As far as regards the Church, its assistance will never be wanting, be the time or the occasion what it may; and it will intervene with the greater effect in proportion as its liberty of action is the more unfettered: let this be carefully noted by those whose office it is to provide for the public welfare. Every minister of holy religion must throw into the conflict all the energy of his mind and all the strength of his endurance; with your authority, venerable brethren, and by your example, they must never cease to urge upon all men of every class, upon the high as well as the lowly, the Gospel doctrines of Christian life; by every means in their power they must strive for the good of the people; and, above all, they must earnestly cherish in themselves, and try to arouse in others, charity, the mistress and queen of virtues. For the happy results we all long for must be chiefly brought about by the plenteous outpouring of charity; of that true Christian charity which is the fulfilling of the whole Gospel law, which is always ready to sacrifice itself for others' sake, and which is man's surest antidote against worldly pride and immoderate love of self; that charity, whose office is described, and whose God-like features are drawn by the Apostle St. Paul in these words: *Charity is patient, is kind . . . seeketh not her own . . . suffereth all things . . . endureth all things* (1 Corinthians xiii. 4-7).

On each one of you, venerable brethren, and on your clergy and people, as an earnest of God's mercy and a mark of our affection, we lovingly in the Lord bestow the Apostolic Benediction.

Given at St. Peter's, in Rome, the fifteenth day of May, 1891, the fourteenth year of our Pontificate,

LEO XIII., POPE.

INDEX

Aarau, Congress of; Decurtins at, 242-3, 355
Ackermann, bill presented by, 151
Adrian IV., 81
Agis, sacrifice of, 35
Agriculture in relation to Socialism, 20
Albertus, 143, 166
Alexander, Emperor, 36
Alsace, Socialism in, 166
Amberg Assembly, report of, 170-1
America, *vide* United States
Anabaptists, their views on property, 71
Anarchical Socialism, causes of, 21-2
Anarchist, a term of reproach among Socialists, 360
Andalusia, agrarian troubles in, 348
Angheria, 78
Anjou barons, oppression by, 78
Anseele, 30; practical views of, 301
Anthropology, principles of, 20
Antisemitism and Catholic Socialism in Austria, 199-233; a form of Socialism, 200; cause of, in Austria, 201-2
Apologists, Early Christian; communistic theories of, 65
Arbeiterbund, Der, 250-1
Arbeiterwohl, Das, 180, 186, 188
Ardant, Gabriel, on attitude of Popes to labour, 290
Aristophanes on Communism, 3
Aristotle, his views on property, 71; on women, 2
Assembly of Swiss bishops at Baden, 254
Association Catholique, 215, 269, 272, 291, 298
Association Catholique des Patrons du Nord, 291, 299
Association de la jeunesse française, 269, 291
Association among vine-growers, 196-7
Associations, Socialist, number of, in Germany, 107
Atheism not part of Socialist programme, 383
Aveling, Dr. E. B., 312
Aveling, Eleanor Marx, 312
Aurelius Augustinus, *v.* St. Augustin
Austria, causes of spread of Socialism in, 199-200; antisemitism and Catholic Socialism in, 199-233
Babœuf, Caius Gracchus; project of, 259
Baden, Swiss bishops at, 254
Bagshawe, Mgr. Edw. G., theories of, 325-30; State Socialism of, 361
Bakunin, 243, 259; criminal theories of, 348; revolutionary views of, 366-8
Bamberger, Ludwig, 391; on German Socialism, 108
Bamel, M. de, 278
Ban of Boston, The, 92
Bankers and publicans of Rome, power of, 36-47, *passim*
Basle, Catholic congress at, 253
Bastiat, 10
Bebel, 10; as authoritarian, 182; as Socialist candidate, 166; his programme, 30
Belcredi, Count Egbert, 214; on usury, 202, 219, 224
Belgium, Catholic party in, 303-5; cause of comparative inaction of Catholics in, 309-10; Socialism in, 30, 301
Bélizal, Viscomte de, 277
Beltrand, practical views of, 301
Benevento, insurrection in, 369
Bentham, Jeremy, theories of, 10-11
Berlin, conference, 247, 249; congress, 176
Berliner Volkstribune, Die, 30
Berry, Bishop of, 27-8
Bertrand, 30
Besse, Father Ludovic de, 266-8
Bildad the Suhite, 57
Bishops, German, congress of, *v.* Fulda
Bismarck, Prince, on German Socialism, 106; his laws of repression 107; effects of persecution of, 108-9; his war against Rome, 109; remedies taken by, 111-2; his persecution of Meyer, 143; his dissolution of the *Bauern Vereine*, 192; his opposition of Von Schorlemer Alst, 197; on guilds, 372
Blanc, Louis, 141
Blanqui, demands of, 259; on claims of labour, 261
Blöme, Count, 214, 219, 224; on Individualism, 225; on corporate bodies, 231
Bodin, Jean, his *Republique*, 7

Bodio, 353
Bongartz, Abbé Arnold, 143; his establishment of journeyman clubs, 183
Bonomelli, Mgr., pastoral letters of, 354-5
Bontoux, 215
Bossuet, on the poor, 74
Bourgeoisie, moneyed, of Rome, power of, 45, 46
Brandts, Franz, president of Masters' Association, 186, 187
Brandts, Victor, Socialism of, 308
Breakspear, Nicholas, 81
Bréda, Count de, views of, 289
Breuker, association of peasants founded by, 189
Brisbane, Bishop of, 27-28
Brun, Lucien, 266
Brutus, usury of, 43
Brzobohoty, Dr., 219
Bulletin Mensuel, Le, 304
Burri, Signor, publications of, 354

Cabet, influence of Christianity on, 83, 84; his Icarian utopias, 101; system of, 265
Cafiero, 370
Campanella, his *Civitas Solis*, 7
Cantonalist insurrection (1873), 348
Capecelatro, Alonso, Archbishop of Capua, on Cardinal Manning, 322; pastoral letter of, 354, 355-6
Capital and labour, early conflicts between, 35
Carlisle, Bishop of, 27-8
Carne, De, 6
Carthage and Rome, contest between, 40
Catholic centre, political attitude, 177-9
Catholic Church, equality in, 79, 80-1; its relation to monasteries, 80; evil effects of impoverishment of, 79; good organisation of, 87-8; and relief of poor, 78, 79; social organisation of, 82; universal character of, 990; compared with Protestantism, on the Social Question, 73-99
Catholic Clergy, on journeymen clubs, 183, 186; on labour, 361
Catholic Communism, cause of, 85-6
Catholic Congress at Basle (1877), 253; at Freiburg, in Breisgan, 249
Catholic journeymen clubs, 116, 182, 183-6; statutes of, 183-5
Catholic party, programme of, in 1884, 170
Catholic Socialism, origin of, 85, 142; importance of, 86-7; programme of, 136; its relation to State democracy, 31, 225; to social Socialism, 171, 232, 362
Catholic Socialism in Austria, 202; in France and Belguim, 258-310; in Italy, 356-7
Catholic Socialist party, causes of its spread in Germany, 180
Catholics in Austria, power of, 387; origin of Catholic Socialists, 202
Catholics in Belgium, 303-5; cause of comparative inaction, 309-10
Catholics in England, position of, 314-5
Catholics in France, 258-310; liberal movement among, 262; action of clergy, 262
Catholics in Germany, power of, 387; increase of their newspapers, 181; cause of spread of Catholic Socialism, 180
Catholics in Italy, effect of vicinity of the Pope on, 351-2; attitude of the clergy to Socialism, 356-7
Catholics in Spain, power of, 387
Catholics in United States, progress of, 331
Cato, usury of, 42-3, 50; his views on slavery, 50
Caudron, Father, 266; at Liége, 362
Cava, Abbey of, 78
Cavalieri, 103
Cavour, Comte de, on law of marriage, 241
Celsus, 63
Chamberlain, agrarian Socialism of, 312
Chambly, Viscomte La Tour du Pin, programme of, 281-3; views of, 272-3
Champion, H. H., 312
Chapelier on State assistance, 10
Charles V. and capitalists, 75
Christ, an Idealist, 58; analogy of teachings to Essenian doctrine, 58-60
Christian Ideal, The, and Socialism, 20-1, 23, 24-6
Christian Socialist, The, 89
Christianity, an Ebionite society, 62; an economic evolution, 64; attitude of Marcus Aurelius towards, 65
Christians, attitude towards wealth, 63-4
Christlich-Sociale Blätter, Die, 132, 135, 142, 174, 180
Church Reformer, The, 90
Cicero, his *De Republica*, 40; his usury, 43
Civil power and relief of the poor, 78
Clans, communistic organisation of, 31

Cleomenes, sacrifice of, 35
Clergy and journeymen clubs, 163; attitude of Alsatian, 166-7, 169-70
Clifford, Dr., Socialism of, 91
Colin, 302
Collectivists, English and American, 93; influence of German, on France, 259
Collectivity, advocates of, 265
Cologne, a stronghold of Socialism, 182
Commerce, development of, among Jews, 54
Common Fund of Leissing, 77
Communism, examples of, 16, 17; of early apologists, 65; of Greece, 33-4; cause of Catholicism, 85-6
Companies, joint-stock, power of, in Rome, 42, 43; spread of financial companies, 46; and Nero, 47
Competition, evils of, 28-9
Committee of Accusation at Congress of the Hague, 367
Comité de l'Œuvre, 271
Condorcet, 9
Conference of Berlin, 247, 249; at Genoa, 252
Conflicts of antiquity, 32-51
Congress, Berlin, 176; Havre, 260; Liége (1886 and 1890), 176, 240-1, 267; Malines, 308; Newcastle, 312; St. Etienne, 260; Saragossa, 349, 350; Vienna *v.* Vienna.
Congress of Catholic labour associations (1888), 254
Conrad of Aargau, 255
Conventions, international, founding of, 245-6; necessity of, 249
Cook, W., 335
Cornaz, 256
Corporation, La, 272
Corporations, restoration of, 224-5, 230-1; in Austria, 224-5; in Hungary, 224-5
Corporations, free, futility of, 149
Corporative system in Germany, tardy abolition of, 151
Corpus Juris Canonici, 69
Corrigan, Archbishop, and Dr. MacGlynn, 380
Cousin, 84
Curci, Father C. M., efforts of, 352-3, 356-7; theories of, 353
Curti, 251, 256
Curtin Committee, 336

Darwin, Charles, theory of, 23-4; school of, 362
De Carne, 6
Decurtins, Gaspard, 29, 92; declaration of, 355; democratic aspiration of, 352; at Freiburg Congress, 249; influence of, 242; his institution of *Sécrétariat Ouvrier*, 245; liberal views of, 242-3, his overtures to Radicals, 246; personality and popularity of, 250, 251; socialism of, 113, 243-4, 244-5; in State protection, 247, 248; and Swiss Catholic Socialism, 234-57
Delahaye, memorial of, 176-7
Deloume, A., on Rome, 42
Democracy, its effects on population, 37
Democracy, social, and Catholic Church, 31
Democratic Socialism, 235; desire to level, 148; error of, 125-6
Democratic Socialism and Catholic Socialists, agreement between, 225
Deputies, Socialist, in Germany, table of, 106
Deschamps on community of property, 8
De Tocqueville, 84; on liberty, 101
Devas, Mr., and minimum wage, 330
Deville, his action at Havre, 260
Diepenbrok, Archbp. of Breslau, 118
Dinamite, La, 367
Dipauli, Baron, 214
Döllinger, Dr. Ignatius, attitude towards infallibility, 120; towards the Social Question, 120; his lectures, 118
Dontcloux, Mgr., Bp. of Liége, 319
Drost, Archbp., 117
Dumonceau, protest of, at Malines, 308-9
Dunajewski, 215
Dunoyer, 10

Ebion, meaning of, 56
Ebionism, doctrine of, 56
Ebionites, Christianity a society of, 62
Economic origins of Christianity, 52-72; régime opposed to social principles of Christianity, 85
Economists, French Catholic, mistaken views of, 113-4
Eden on Catholic Church, 82
Eichhorn, Abbé, theories of, 223
Engels, Frederick, 90, 258
England, Christian Socialism in, 89; Catholics of, 313; position of Catholics in, 314-5; cause of slow development of Socialism in, 311-2
Ephor, the, 35
Epitadeus, 35

Equality, Socialist theories on, 19-20
Essenian doctrine, 58; analogy to teachings of Christ, 58-60
Études Religieuses, Les, 266
Evangelical Socialism, 85; German, 97; Swiss, 92
Evolution, economic, Christianity an, 64

Falkenhayn, Count von, 214
Fathers of the Church, views on property held by, 65-72
Favon, his union with Catholics, 246
Feigenwinter, Dr., 253
Ferroul, Deputy of Narbonne, 278
Fichaux, Abbé, 298
Fichte, 258; a pioneer of Socialism, 100, 105
Flaminius, agrarian laws of, 47
Flürscheim, 158, 222
Fortini at Insurrection of Benevento, 369-70
Fourier, demands of, 259; Socialism of, 101; system of, 265
Frankenstein, Baron von, on political position of Catholic centre, 177-8
Frederick II., preambles to edicts of, 104
Frei, Colonel, of Basle, and labour laws, 245, 246
Freiburg-in-Breisgau, Catholic Congress at, 249
Freie Vereinigung d. Kathol Socialen Politiker, 174, 225
French Catholics, action of clergy, 262; liberal movement among, 261; mistaken view of their economists, 113
French Protestant Church, attitude towards Socialism, 92-3
French Socialism, cause of, 101; leaders of, 260; origin of, 259-60
Freppel, Mgr., views of, 267; change of views of, 278
Friars, Mendicant, their views on property, 71-2
Fribourg, University of, founding of, 255
Fristot, Father, programme accepted by, 266
Fulda, Congress of, 132, 175
Fustel de Coulanges, on Greece, 37

Génévois, Le, 246
Geneva Conference, 252
Geoffroy de Grand Maison, views of, 273, 278
George, Henry, 27, 89; following of, 91, 91-2; and the Pope, 344
German Catholic clergy, and social democracy, 381
German Catholic Socialism, *v.* Socialism in Germany
German Catholic Socialists, economic doctrines of, 130-79; social action of, 180-98
Germania, Die, 180
Gewerkvereine, statistics of, 104
Gibbons, Cardinal, and Knights of Labour, 333, 341, 342, 343; his intercession for the poor, 351
Gide, Charles, programme of, 93
Gildes des Ambachten, 304
Gildes des Metiers, 304
Gili, Don José Morgades y, Bishop of Vich, remedies of, 350
Girdlestone, Rev. Dr., Socialism of, 91
Gorres, editor, 161
Gracchi, the, 44, 47-8
Greece, Ancient, communism of, 33-4; cause of decline of, 36, 37; Socialist doctrines non-existent in, 49, 51
Greenback Labour party, 336
Grenlich, 256
Gronheid, Vicar of Münster, 132
Guérin, Urbain, views of, 373
Guesde, action of, at Havre, 260
Guild of St. Matthew, 89, 90, 91
Guild system, merits of, 372
Guilds, compulsory formation of, 152; effect of trade guilds, 14; their principles, 16; movement in Spain, 349
Guizot, 84

Haberland, bill due to, 152-3
Haid, programme of, 170
Halle Congress (1890), 359
Harmel, Léon, application of theories of, 293-7; on free guilds, 290-1, 292; economic theories of, 292-7
Harrington, his *Oceana*, 7
Hartmann, scheme of, 169
Hatzfeld, Countess von, 131
Havre Congress, 260
Headlam, Rev. Stewart B., position of, 89-90, 98; Socialism of, 314
Hegel, theories of, 12
Heine, Heinrich, abuse of Döllinger, 115
Helleputte, N., statement of, 309
Hertling, Count von, 143; influence of, 165; speech of, 155-6; views on labour, 156
Hervé-Bazin, 292
Historisch-politische Blätter, Die, 180
Hitze, Abbé, 29, 142; conclusions of, 150-1; bill due to, 152, 153; consequence of theories of, 153-4; on

alms-giving, 154; influence of, on French school, 290; his intervention for working-classes, 177; recognition of, 154; as reviewer, 180; as secretary of Master's Association, 186; Spanish edition of his *Sociale Frage*, 349; views of, 143-6; work of, 361
Hobbes, Thomas, on sovereign rights, 11
Hödel, 107
Hohenberg, 143, 166
Holy Trinity, Monastery of the Most, 78
Huber, mistake of, 127
Huet, François, theories of, 301-3
Hughes, Thomas, 88
Huntington, Frederick van, Bp. of New York, 92
Huss, his views on property, 71
Hyndman, H. M., 312; on Catholic Church, 81, 82; on causes of pauperism, 313-4; on effect of Protestantism, 82

Individualism, 77, 265; ancient, 68; cause of Lutheran Reformation, 85; an evil, 163; relation to decline of Greece, 36; of Rome, 41; tendencies towards, 34; contrary to laws of Christianity, 298
Industries, organisation of, 149-50
Insurrection, Cantonalist (1873), 348
Interest, 163
Internationals, the two, 108
Ireland, Mgr., Archbp. of St. Paul's, Socialism of, 345-7
Italian Catholics, 367; attitude of clergy to Socialism, 356-71; to Henry George, 380; effect of vicinity of Papacy on, 351-2

Jacobini, Mgr., on power of civil law, 251
Jäger, influence of Ketteler and Hitze on, 165
Jagetzow, *v.* Rodbertus
Jannet, Claude, on association of masters, 188; chief disciples of, 299; important position of, 265-6; pessimism of, 111; theories of, 266, 299-300
Jews, development of commerce among, 54; system of property among, 53-4; monopoly of land as well as money by Austrian Jews, 200-1
Jörg, 143; influence of Ketteler and Hitze on, 165
Jugurtha, King of Numidia; his disgust with Rome, 43
Juvenal, so-called "democratic" spirit of, 5

Katheder-Socialisten, Die, 361
Keen, R. W., 335
Keller, defeat of, at Mülhausen, 166; theories of, 166-7
Kennedy, J., 335
Ketteler, Baron W. E., Archbishop of Mayence, 29; on abuse of capital, 128; activity of, 94; his appreciation of popular claims, 351; associations patronised by, 185; his attitude in politics, 120; to infallibility, 120; his faith in Christian charity, 128-9; feudalism of, 114; a follower of Lassalle, 122, 127; life and death of, 121; result of movement due to him, 382; his Socialism, 89, 91, 100-129; spread of his ideas, 130-1; in Austria, 202; his struggle with German Government, 121; a supporter of Kolping, 183; on State intervention, 241; his theory as to poor relief, 126; his work, 116, 361
Kingsley, Canon Charles, 88-9; his Socialism, 312
Klein, E., and journeymen clubs, 183
Knights of Labour, founding of the society, 333; object and rules, 334-5, 336-8; first assembly, 335; rapid advance, 336; demands 338-9; excommunicated by the Pope (1885), 340; revocation of the excommunication, 341, 344; manifesto of (1882), 340-1
Kolb, Father, a State intervention, 230
Kolping, Father, propaganda of, 182; work of, 116; working-men's clubs established by, 182-3
Kopp, Mgr., Archbishop of Breslau, 177
Korum, Mgr., Bishop of Trèves, on State support, 176
Kronenberg, and journeymen clubs, 183
Kuefstein, Count, 224; on condition of working-classes, 225-6; on corporative bodies, 231
Kulturkampf, Der, effects of, 109

Laaf, Herr, and journeymen clubs, 183
Labour, early conflicts with capital, 35; State regulation of, 153, 156, 161
Labour Movement, its difference from Socialism, 168-9
Labour party in United States, 333
Labour System, cause of change in, 163-4
Labrum, Dr., Socialism of, 91
Lacordaire, Liberal movement of, 262

Lafargue, action of, at Havre, 260
Lamennais, 84, 88, 262
Lassalle, Ferdinand, and co-operation, 241; and Helena von Dönniges, 131; his influence in France, 259; "Iron Law" of, 244, 287; productive associations of, 127; propaganda of, 30, 31, 100, 115; on Sickingen, 74-5; sympathy of Catholic clergy with, 131; views of, 122
Latifundia, competition of, 41; formation of, in Rome, 39
Laveleye, 15; on democracy, 37; on Socialism in Germany, 105; on success of Catholic Socialists, 135-6
Laws, Social, origin of German, 111
Lazzaretti, David, rising led by, 368; theories of, 368-9
Legrand, Daniel, and international conventions, 245-6
Lehmkuhl, Father, 176
Leo XIII., Pope, address to French workmen (1889), 371-2; advance towards Socialism, 371; Encyclical letter (1878), 373; (1891), 373-9, 381; and Irish bishops, 380; letter denouncing Socialism, 370-1; Pastoral letter of, 365; personal views on Socialism, 358, 363-5; trouble with inferior clergy, 368
Le Play, theories of, 263-4, 265, 266-7; attitude of his disciples, 268
Leroux, fancies of, 101
Leroy-Beaulieu and Socialism, 6; pessimism of, 111
Letourneau, 35; on economic evolution, 41
Lex, Falcidia, 39; *Furia*, 39; *Glicia*, 39; *Julia et Papia Poppœa*, 40
Liberal School, social influence of, 10
Liberatore, Father, publications of, 354
Liberty, distrust in effects of, 102
Lichtenstein, Prince A. von, on corporative bodies, 231; on labour, 361; as Socialist, 214, 215-8; on usury, 202, 224
Licinius Stolo, agrarian laws of, 47
Liebknecht, 182; at Congress of Halle, 383, 391; programme of, 30, 31
Liége, a hot-bed of anarchy, 301; Congress (1890), 176, 266, 362
Loë, Baron Felix von, society founded by, 195-6
Loria, on position of working-men, 15-6
Lösewitz, Count, 142; Collectivist views of, 158; on position of working men, 158-60; Socialism of, 113
Löcoenstein, Prince, 170
Ludlow, J. M., 88
Luther, Martin, attitude to peasant revolt, 75-6; suggestions for relief of poor, 77; views on property, 74, 75-7
Lutheran Reformation, cause why individualistic, 85; differences from Catholic Church on pauperism, 77; in favour of wealthy, 74
Lycurgus, Reforms of, 35
Lynch, Mgr., of Toronto, on the right to steal, 318

Mably, Abbé, on law, 7-8
Macaulay, Rob. C., 335
MacGlynn, Rev. Dr., attitude of, 344-5
MacHale, Archbishop, on right to steal, 318
Machinery, effects of, 146, 147-8, 247-8; remedy for effects of, 148, 149, 150
Malalesta, 370
Malines Congress, 308
Malon, Benoît, on attitude of Mun, 268-9; change of attitude of, 260-1; a leader of Possibilists, 260
Manchester, Bishop of, and Socialism, 27-8
Manchester School, theories of, 134-5, 142
Manning, Cardinal H. E., and Dock Strike, 315, 321; and individualism, 323; his intercession for poor, 351; his defence of Knights of Labour, 342-3; on labour, 316-7, 318-9, 361; on limitation of labour, 319-20; on necessity of influence of the Church, 382; popularity of, 315; on right to steal, 317-8; Socialism of, 114; on State intervention, 320-1; theories of, 315-23; Ultramontanism of, 114
Mano Nera, La, 348, 367
Marat, 9
Marcus Aurelius, his attitude to Christianity, 65
Marlo, a pioneer of Socialism, 100; social views of, 85
Marx, Karl, collectivism of, 348; doctrines of, 30, 89; his influence on Anglican clergy, 90; his view of Liberal economy, 207; propaganda of, 100
Marxists, 91; dissensions with Possibilists, 261
Masters, association of, 186; articles of, 187-8
Maurice, Rev. F. D., 88-9
Maxen, Professor, propaganda of, 202
Mearns, Dr., Socialism of, 91

Megara, Insurrection of, 36
Melancthon, Philip, his views on property, 76
Melchers, Archbishop of Cologne, 118
Mendicant Friars, their views on property, 71-2
Mermillod, Cardinal, 371; founder of Catholic Socialism in Switzerland, 237; Infallibilism of, 114; programme of, 242; on State intervention, 241-2; theories of, 237-40
Messenia, insurrection of, 36
"Messiah of Trèves, the," followers of, 91
Meyer, Dr. Rudolph, 143; on agrarian question, 211, 213-4; his attack on Bismarck, 203; on Count Taaffe, 215; expulsion from Austria, 215; from Germany, 203; reputation of, 203; Socialism of, 113; theories of, 203-14; effect produced by his theories, 224
Michael, 258
Michigan, Bishop of, and Socialism, 27-8
Middle-classes, English, Socialist tendencies of, 312-3
Mihir, Nerseh, 63
Mill, John Stuart, land-tenure reform of, 11; on Socialist remedies, 29; utilitarian principles of, 10, 11
Mississippi, Bishop of, and Socialism, 27-8
Molinari, G. de, on Cardinal Manning, 360
Mommsen, on capitalists, 45-6
Monasteries, relations to Catholic Church, 80
Monastery of the most Holy Trinity, 78
Monatsschrift für christl. Social-reform, 218
Montalembert, Liberal movement of, 262, 278
Montesquieu, his ideal of Socialism, 9-10
More, Sir Thomas, his *Utopia*, 7
Morel, Abbé, his criticism of capitalism, 288
Morelly, his *Code de la Nature*, 7
Morgadesy, Gili, Don José, Bishop of Vich, 350
Morris, William, 312
Morte ai Borghesi, 367
Moufang, Canon Christopher, 119; career of, 136; his disagreement with Ricardo's theories, 137; on duty of State working-classes, 138-42; on poor relief, 137; programme of, 136, 137-8
Mun, Count Albert de, 29, 158, 267; action of, 270-1; adverse criticism of, 325; programme of, 290; propaganda of, 268; his Socialism, 300; on State interference, 277, 278-80; theories of, 273-80; work of, 361

Necker, F., aim of society founded by, 92; on political power, 9; on property, 8
Nero and financial companies, 47
Newcastle Congress and working day, 312
New Harmony, America, foundation of, 84
New Lanark, Scotland, foundation of, 84
Noailles, De, on Athenian Republic, 4
Nobling, 107
Nôtre Dame de l'Usine, Confraternity of, founding of, 298

Œuvre des Cercles catholiques d'ouvriers, 268, 291; founding of, 270-1; rules of, 271-2
Oligarchies, financial, rise of, 34
Orti, Don Juan M., 349
Owen, Robert, 12; influence of Christianity on, 84

Papacy and the Social Question, 358-92; present influence of, 385-6; loss of influence of, in Italy, 388, 389
Parliament, English, power of Irish Catholics in, 387
Pascal, Father G. de, on Mgr. Mermillod, 239; views of, 273, 286-8
Pattaï, Dr., 219
Peasants' Revolt, 75
Pecci, Cardinal Gioacchino, *v.* Leo XIII.
Pecqueur, demands of, 259
Pelagius, his views on property, 71
Perangheria, 79
Périn, Charles, 303; on free guilds, 379; theories of, 263, 264-5; attitude of disciples of, 268
Petit, Jean, his views on property, 71
Petites Sœurs de l'Ouvrier, foundation of, 298
Philip, Abbot, 79
Pittsburg, Bishop of, and Socialism, 27-8
Plato on democratic society, 2, 3
Plumptre, Dean, and Socialism, 28
Plutarch, 34; on population of Greece, 38-9; on Tiberius Gracchus, 45
Political Economy, Science of, limited sphere of, 16

Polybius on population, 38
Pompey, 45
Pomponius Veientanus, frauds of, 45
Poor relief and teaching of the Church, 73-4
Population, effects of democracy on, 37
Possibilists, dissensions with Marxists, 261
Posthumius, frauds of, 45
Pottier, Abbé, theories of, 305-8
Powderly, Terence W., and Greenback Labour party, 336
Preussisches Allgemeine Landrecht, 104
Progress of Catholic Socialism, 311-57
Property, history of, in Rome, 39-49; irresponsibility of, 19; transformations of, 17-8; views on, held by Fathers of the Church, 65-72
Prophets, Jewish, their views on usury, 57
Protestant Churches, want of unity among, 98; weakness of, 87-8
Proudhon, demands of, 259; sayings of, 260; on the Social Question, 261; theories of, 101; system of, 265
Prussia, the classic land of Socialism, 94
Python of Fribourg, 255

Ratzinger, Dr. George, 143; his influence on French school, 290; on labour and capital, 156-7
Referendum, the, 235
Reformation, *v.* Lutheran Reformation
Réforme Sociale, La, 265
Reformed Church, Socialist tendencies of, 88
Règne Sociale du Chrétienisme, 301
Reisach, Bishop, his advice to Ketteler, 117-8
Renan, on Christianity, 25; on prophets of Israel, 55-6; on the Social Question, 3
Revolution, French, and Socialism, 7-10; views of precursors of, 7-10
Revue des Institutions et du Droit, La, 266
Revue Socialiste, 261
Reybaud, Louis, 100
Rheinische Merkur, Die, 181
Rheinischer Bauern-Verein, 196
Rhodes, insurrection of, 36
Ricardo, 10
Rive, Théodore de la, sentimental Socialism of, 252-3
Rochester, Bishop of, and Socialism, 27-8
Rodbertus, 203, 258; and distributive societies, 89; a pioneer of Socialism, 100; theories of, 204
Rogers, Professor Thorold, on the Catholic Church, 82
Roquefeuil, Count de, on position of labour, 288-9
Roman Law, evil effects of, in Austria, 212; in Germany, 195; in Italy, 212; influence exercised by, 164; aversion to, among German Catholics, 165
Rome, Ancient, cause of decay of, 40-8, 164-5; contest with Carthage, 40; power of bourgeoisie of, 45, 46; history of property in, 39-49; protectionists of, 40-1; Socialist doctrines never adopted by, 48, 49, 51; usury in, 42
Roscher, on poor relief, 73
Rossi, Senator, 10; economic theories of, 356
Rouanet, E., on French working classes, 261

St. Ambrose, his views on property, 66
St. Augustin, his views on property, 67, 69, 71
St. Basil the Great, his views on property, 67, 69
St. Clement, his views on property, 66, 69-70
St. Gregory the Great, his views on property, 66
St. James, menaces of, towards the rich, 61
St. Jerome, his views on property, 69
St. John Chrysostom, his views on property, 66, 67-8, 69
St. Justin, Communism of, 64
St. Matthew, occupation of, 62
St. Paul, ideal of, 62
St. Raphael, Society of, 303
St. Thomas Aquinas, 307; on relief of poor, 73-4; his views on property, 71
Saint-Etienne, congress at, 260
Saint-Just, 9
Saint-Simon, demands of, 259; influence of Christianity on, 83; Socialism of, 101; views on, 83-4; system of, 265
Samos, insurrection of, 36
Saragossa, Congress at, 349, 350
Savigny, theory of, 12
Scalabrini, Mgr., Bp. of Piacenza, and emigration, 356
Schäffle, Dr. A., 112
Scheel, Professor von, 95
Schener, 256
Schindler, Professor, on corporation bodies, 231
Schings, Abbé, 132, 142, 166; on corporations, 174-5; on journeymen clubs, 183; as reviewer, 180

Schmid, Professor Leopold, 118
Schönerer, Herr von, popularity of his antisemitic views, 232-3
Schopenhauer, Arthur, on might and right, 12
Schorlemer-Alst, Baron von, 132; associations founded by, 188-9; and banks of credit, 194-5; and co-operative societies, 193-4; opposition to, by Bismarck, 197; speeches of, 189-91; and usury, 194
Schultze of Paderborn, 132
Schulze-Delitzsch, 125, 127, 128
Sécrétariat Ouvrier, Le, 245
Ségur-Lamoignon, Vicomte de, news of, 273, 283-6
Seleucides, the, 56
Sémichon, N., his criticism of capitalism, 288
Seneca, usury of, 43
Senior, W. Nassau, 10
Sickingen, Franz von, 74
Simeoni, Cardinal, 343
Sixtus, V., 81
Slavery, attitude of ancient world towards, 49-50
Smith, Adam, economic views of, 162, 165; on the Catholic Church, 82
Social conflicts of antiquity and modern Socialism, 32-51
Social democracy and Catholic Church, 31; and German clergy, 381
Socialism, adaptability of, 29-30; and agriculture, 20; attitude to Christianity, 20-1, 23, 24-6; cause of progress of, 13-5, 20, 29; and Christianity, 1-31; dangers of, 29; opposed to individualism, 77; and Labour Movement, 168-9; essentially modern, 32, 33; modern, 1; influence of Christianity on, 83; programme of, 360; objects of precursors of, 7; origins of, 7; religion of, 22; remedies, 19; theories as to wealth, 19-20
—— anarchical, cause of, 21-2
—— Catholic, importance and benefit of, 86-7, 163; origin of, 85; programme of, 136; causes of spread in Germany, 180; attitude to State Socialism, 171-9, 232
—— Christian monarchical, 94
—— democratic, 235; its desire to level, 148; error of, 125-6
—— economic, 1
—— ethical, 1
—— Evangelical, 85
—— State, Conservative tendency of, 359-60; *v.* also State interference
—— ultramontane societies, 132
Socialism in Alsace, 166
—— in America, 332-3; Christian, 91-2
—— in Austria, causes of its spread in, 199-200
—— in Belgium, 30; its demands, 301; its position, 301
—— in England, cause of slow development of, 311-2; Christian, 89
—— in France, cause of, 101; leaders of, 260; origin of, 259-60
—— in Germany, 30, 100; action of Socialists, 12-3; cause of, 101; of rapid spread of, 102-3, 104, 105-6, 107, 108; Cologne a stronghold of, 182; Evangelical, 97; more scientific than Austrian, 232; programme of, 107-8; State Socialism, 110-1; theories on equality, 19; tyranny of, 31
—— in Greece (ancient), 49, 51
—— in Italy (modern), 367
—— in Rome (ancient), 48, 49, 51
—— in Spain, 348
—— in Switzerland, 236; Catholic, 237; Evangelical, 92
—— of Equality, 302
Società della famiglie Cristiane, 368
Sociology, principles of, 20; result of, rational sociology, 160
Solomon, King, luxury of, 54
Solon, his attitude towards wealth, 34; reforms of, 35, 36
Sonderbund War, the, 236
Sozialdemokrat, Der, 107
Spain, guild movement in, 349; Socialism in, 348
Sparta, cause of predominance of, 35; community of goods in, 37
Spence, Thomas, and land nationalisation, 312
Spurius Cassius, agrarian laws of, 47
State interference, exaggerated faith in, 102, 103, 104, 105, 109-10; conservative tendency of, 359-60; German, 110-1
Stead, Rev. H., Socialism of, 91
Stead, W. T., on the Papacy, 384
Stephens, Uriah S., 335; founding of Society of Knights of Labour by, 333-4; theories of, 333-4
Stimmer aus Maria Laach, 176
Stirner, Max, theory of, 12
Stöcker, Dr. Adolph, activity of, 95-6; antisemitism of, 95-6; and Socialism, 89, 91
Stumm, Herr, character of, 111
Switzerland, cause of comparative freedom from Socialist agitation, 236; Cantonal Assembly in, 235; condi-

tion of working classes in, 234-5; founding of Catholic Socialism in, 237; maximum working day in, 250; referendum in, 235; Radicals and Catholics in, 255-6
Sydney, Bishop of, and Socialism, 27-8
Symes, Rev. E., programme of, 90-1
Syria, social conflicts in, 52

Taaffe, Count, bill brought in by, 214
Tamburrini, at insurrection of Benevento, 370
Taylor, Helen, 312
Tertullian, Communism of, 64
Thellier de Poncheville, M. de, 278
Thibaut, theory of, 12
Thompson, Dr., Archbishop of York, and Socialism, 27
Thun, Count Leo, 202
Todt, Rudolph, activity of, 95; views of, 96
Torreanar, Count di, on guild system, 349
Toussenel, on success of Jews, 162
Towers, his *Illustrations of Prophecy*, 7
Trade Unions, futility of, 149
Treitschke, Professor, on social misery, 254

Ulpian, on property, 39
Ultramontane Socialist societies, 132
Union Catholique d'Études Sociales et Economiques, 239
Union des Patrons en faveur des Ouvriers, 304
Unions, trade, futility of, 149
United States, Christian Socialism in, 91-2; Labour party in, 338; poverty in, 332; progress of Catholic Church in, 331; restrictive laws on interest, 208-9; Socialism in, 332-3
Usury in Rome, 42; views of Jewish prophets on, 57

Val-des-Bois, Corporation of, government of, 293-7
Vaterland, Das, editors of, 214
Vatican, *v.* Leo XIII.
Vaughan, Very Rev. Herbert, attitude to Socialism, 324
Verein für Social-Politik, Congress held by the, 112
Verres, usury of, 43
Vingtième Siècle, Le, 291-2
Victoria, Queen, her attitude towards the Papacy, 387-8
Vienna, Congress (1888), 231; (1889), 231; (1890), 232
Villemain, 84
Vine-growers, association among, 196-7
Vogelsang, Baron Karl von, 203; democratic aspiration of, 352; effect of his theories, 224; eminence of, 218; an enemy to Liberalism, 219; his influence on French school, 290; his investigations into conditions of labour, 224; views of, 219-23; work of, 361
Vogüé, Vicomte de, on the Papacy, 384-5
Volders, 30; practical views of, 301
Vollmar, Von, views of, 182
Voornit, De, 30
Voyage en Icarie, 84
Vrau, Féron M., on introduction of nuns as factory superintendents, 293

Wagner, Prof. Adolph, 95, 112; as critic of social religion, 22-3
Wakefield, Bishop of, and Socialism, 27-8
Wallace, Alfred R., and land nationalisation, 312
Walsh, Mgr., Archbishop of Dublin, and agrarian Socialism, 331
Wealth, effects of amassing, 18; effects of selection by, 18; Socialist theories of, 19
Weiss, Father Albert, 29; on duties of Catholics towards social questions, 226-30; at Fribourg University, 255
Werner, Wilhelm, 30, 31, 182
Westcott, Bishop, Socialism of, 91
Westfalischer Bauern-Vereine, formation of, 189; dissolution ordered, 192; views of, 193
William II. of Germany, 108; attitude towards Socialism, 112-3
Williams, 312
Windhorst, Von, 154, 177
Winterer, Abbé, on compulsory insurance, 178; theories of, 166-8, 169
Woeste, De, theories of, 304-5
Wright, James L., 335
Wycliffe, John, his views on property, 71

Xenophon and the democratic ideal, 3

Zallinger, Count, 214
Zukunft, Die, on religion, 26-7
Zünftler party, 151

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

POPULATION

AND THE

SOCIAL SYSTEM.

Crown 8vo, Cloth, 2s. 6d.

[*Social Science Series.*

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"A very valuable work by a well-known Italian Economist. For sound political and economic thought this work will bear comparison with the best."—*Westminster Review.*

"A work that comprises a compact epitome or historical review of the various theories of population propounded by Economists during the last hundred years—that is, from the famous *Essay on the Principle of Population* of Malthus to the present day."—*Saturday Review.*

"A most useful compendium of the main facts and arguments concerning this intricate problem."—*Economic Review.*

"Signor Nitti's work is interesting from the number of facts and opinions which the writer has brought together."—*Times.*

"A wonderful monument of insight and acumen."—*Glasgow Herald.*

"A very thorough and ably written criticism of the pessimistic school of social Economists and of the doctrines of Malthus."—*Nottingham Guardian.*

LONDON:
SWAN SONNENSCHEIN & CO.
NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS

ON

SOCIALISMO CATHOLICO.

"An English translation of the present work is in preparation and will be welcomed by many students of social questions. There is no book in the English language from which the same information can be obtained; and Professor Nitti has put together, in a thoroughly readable form, results gathered from very many French and German authorities." —*Economic Review.*

"Signor Nitti proposes to study in a series of volumes all the principal forms of modern Socialism. . . . Though other writers have already done this same work (for instance, M. de Laveleye and Mr. Rae), there is room enough for Signor Nitti's volumes. . . . In his first volume he has succeeded admirably in his attempt to give an unbiassed, full and faithful account of Catholic Socialism; and, if the other volumes are as good, the series will form the most important work on the whole movement of Socialism which has yet been written."—G. R. MACDONNEL in the *Economic Journal.*

"In the present volume he devotes himself exclusively to Catholic Socialism, of which he has given us a remarkably interesting and extended account. This remarkable work will henceforth stand as the authoritative history of Catholic Socialism." PROFESSOR E. R. SELIGMAN in the *Political Science Quarterly.*

"Any one wishing to read all that is important in the literature of Christian Socialism in recent times, and the manifold efforts made in various directions by politicians of this way of thinking, will find in Professor Nitti a painstaking, scholarly and reliable guide."—M. KAUFFMAN in the *Foreign Church Chronicle and Review.*

"A truly admirable work."—CARDINAL H. E. MANNING, Archbishop of Westminster.

"A learned and interesting volume."—LUIGI COSSA.

"A valuable and conscientious work."—ACHILLE LORIA.

"He treats with singular impartiality the origin, development and present position of Catholic Socialism in Germany, Austria, Switzerland, France, Spain, Italy, England and America."—PROFESSOR GUILLAUME DE GREEF in *La Réforme* (Brussels).

"This book is excellent, no less for the full information which it contains than for the conciliatory and equitable spirit which has inspired it."—A. OTT in the *Journal des Economistes.*

University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1388
Return this material to the library
from which it was borrowed.